00027637

BOMBAY BRANCH
OF THE
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.
TOWN HALL, BOMBAY.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 09 March, 2016

EXERCISES,

POLITICAL AND OTHERS.

27637 ac

By Lieut. Colonel T. Perronet Thompson.

Consisting of matter previously published with and without the author's name, and of some not published before.

IN SIX VOLUMES.

RR d 19

VOL. I.

Second Edition.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY EFFINGHAM WILSON, ROYAL EXCHANGE.

1843.

27637

London: W. Clowes and Sons, Stamford Street.

PREFACE

TO ALL THE VOLUMES.

THE first impression on review of this publication, part of which dates from a considerable time back, is the very slight degree in which circumstances are substantially altered. Like the mounted sentries at the Horse Guards, they might be taken for the same instead of a succession; so like in all important points is the new face of things to the old. It may not be John, it may be Robert, whose feet are actually in the stirrups; but Robert and John are one, in the eyes of the rustic spectator who looks only to the general effect.

Scarcely any great quarrel existed at the earliest period referred to, of which the roots are not as much in the ground as ever, though some of the stalks have been pulled up. The argument on the Catholic Question, may be re-read with a transference to Church Monopolies of other kinds; and the agitation preceding the Reform Bill, may hold a lantern to show how little has been accomplished, and how much thrown away.

In the department of Political Economy, something like a manual for one side of the struggle at this moment at its height, may be collected from the subjects and quotations introduced.

On what has obtained the name of the "Greatest-Happiness Principle," a continued discussion will be found kept up. The writer would be glad to think he had availed to make the subject clearer, to any of those who profess to find difficulties in the style or matter of the original propounder.

On the Military System of Napoleon, he has endeavoured to collect and compress, what might be sought and perhaps missed, in the pages of bulletins and the comments of friends and foes. On some military questions of detail, articles and observations will be found, which must owe any interest, to having been framed under the guidance of experiment, and published generally with some view to the advancement of the liberal cause.

On the principles of Geometry as connected with the *vexata quæstio* of the Theory of Parallels, inquiries will be found which, like those of the alchemists, lead to useful results though without implying a claim to general success. On the mathematics of Music, observations and experiments will be met with, which when the tide shall set in that direction, may be turned to the improvement of the executive branch of Harmony.

The documents connected with Sierra Leone point to remarkable facts in the history of that colony. The Treaty of January

1820 in the Persian Gulph, is a transcript of the first public act in which the Slave Trade was written down Piracy.

The "Letters of a Representative" were written to the constituency of Hull, during a short period of sitting in parliament. That the consequence on the first opportunity was permanent exclusion from the House of Commons, by the exertions at different times and places of the leaders of almost every class assuming the name of Liberals, may be not without its value to such as may ever employ themselves in raking among the characteristics of the times. *Eight* Conservatives, with more or less directness, were introduced in part of process; of whom five were on the benches at once, making a difference of ten upon the votes, being within two or three of some of the majorities by which the Whigs were expelled from office.

On Irish questions, the author has gone as close to the enemy, as any sane leader could desire. The return made him, was fierce attack from the "boys" of Kilkenny, when he was seen ridden over as in the way of the compact by which three kingdoms were turned over to the Tories.

Both in those Letters, and others to various portions of the public press which follow, useful references will be found to gone-by events, and to the feelings and arguments by which they were attended. If proof is sometimes presented of the prudence of dealing with enemies as if they were some day to be friends, and with friends as if they were to be enemies, there can be nothing surprising in finding a precept of antiquity confirmed by the experience of the passing hour.

On one point, an observation may be serviceable. The writer adhered to the people called Chartists, till they denounced him in their gazette and added the enormous childishness of telling the House of Commons they wanted an edge tool and wanted it to cut the givers' throats. On such adhesion, there will of course be a diversity of opinions; but there are always enough to quit the party of the poor, the moment abiding by it will make an unfavourable balance of twenty votes at an election. The observation intended was, that much of what the Chartists did not use, might be found cut and dried for any other portion of the public, who should apply themselves to compass a substantial and not a mock Reform.

To A. S., J. S., and S. B., Esqs., the survivors of the friends mentioned in the Appendix, the thanks of the writer are due, for the readiness with which they permitted the use of Articles in which a mixture of hands was concerned.

Blackheath, London. 1 *August*, 1842.

INDEX TO ALL THE VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

Articles from the Westminster Review, 1829—1831; as follow.

	Page
Catholic Question (republished as "*Catholic State Waggon*")	1
Béranger's *Songs*	36
Absenteeism	52
System of Fagging	58
Banking	63
Disabilities of the Jews	70
Poor Humphrey's Calendar	79
Forty-Shilling Freeholders	82
Corn Laws	87
Quipos, or Peruvian Knot-Records	96
"*Greatest-Happiness Principle.*" No. I.	121
Slavery in the West Indies	136
Essays on the Pursuit of Truth, &c.	152
Desirableness of the Re-union of Belgium to France	165
Edinburgh Review and the "Greatest-Happiness Principle." No. II.	180
Free Trade	191
Radical Reform	219
Edinburgh Review and the "Greatest-Happiness Principle." No. III.	229
Taxes on Literature, The "Six Acts"	247
Le Représentant des Peuples	261
Religious Disabilities	269
Distress of the Country	278
Great Britain and France	287
Geometry without Axioms	306
Revolution of 1830	313
Defensive Force	328
East-India Trade	344
Machine-Breaking	353
European Revolution	373
Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society	381
Parliamentary Reform	413
Poland and France	429
Annals and Antiquities of Rajast'han	437
Military System of Napoleon	440
Belgium and the Holy Alliance	453
Quarterly Journal of Education	462
Appel aux Représentans de la France	473
Prospects from Tory Reaction	478

Programmes to various Nos. to be found in their order.

VOL. II.

Articles from Westminster Review, 1832—1833; as follow. Page

Archbishop of Dublin on Political Economy 1
Adjustment of the House of Peers 23
Saint-Simonianism, &c. 34
Improvement of Condition of the Clergy 75
Silk and Glove Trades 95
Enharmonic of the Ancients 99
French Commerce 159
Dr. Chalmers *on Political Economy* 167
Renewal of Bank Charter 200
Supplement to Article on Silk and Glove Trades . . . 218
Prospects of Reform 225
McCulloch's *Edition of the "Wealth of Nations"* . . . 238
Gardiner's *Music of Nature* 282
Second Supplement to Article on Silk and Glove Trades . . 303
Wainewright's *Vindication of Paley. Fort Risban* . . . 306
Supplement to Article on Renewal of Bank Charter . . . 314
Viscount Milton's *Address to the Landowners on the Corn Laws* 316
The Fall of the Constitution 320
Report of Secret Committee on Bank Charter 329
Harmonics of the Violin 337
Bishop of Bath and Wells *on Commutation of Tithes* . . 345
Colonel Torrens's *Letters on Commercial Policy* . . . 351
Third Supplement to Article on Silk and Glove Trades . . 358
Policy, Justice, and Consequences of the Dutch War. . . 368
Equitable Adjustment (with Tables by Mr. J. Childs of Bungay). 374
Booth's *Free Trade as it affects the People* 392
Effects of Abolition and Commutation of Tithes . . . 401
Fourth Supplement to Article on Silk and Glove Trades . 406
Colonel Torrens's *Additional Letters on Commercial Policy*. . 409
Musical Periodicals 414
Ireland 417
Property Tax 433
Whewell's *First Principles of Mechanics* 441
Nathan *on the History and Theory of Music* 459
A Free Trader's Defence of the "Mercantile System" . . 466
London University Magazine. Note on Austin's Jurisprudence . 479
Otto *on the Violin* 482
Question of Absenteeism reducible to the Principles of Free Trade 486
Notes and Additions to various parts 496
Programmes to various Nos. to be found in their order.

VOL. III.

Articles from Westminster Review, 1834—1835, with Appendix; as follow.

	Page
Dr. Chalmers's *Bridgewater Treatise*	2
Jews' Harps, &c. Life of Eulenstein	22
Importance of Belgian Independence	36
Economy of paying twice over	43
The Suffering Rich	70
Royal Society and M. Legendre	79
Use of the Subjunctive Mood in English	89
Impressment and Flogging	93
Quarterly Review, &c. in Support of Corn Monopoly	100
Bentham's *Deontology*	108
Pamphlet in Modern Greek and French, on Out-post Cavalry	126
Do. on Telegraphers for Field Service, horse and foot	134
First Report of Messrs. Villiers and Bowring	137
Cab and Omnibus Nuisance	148
Bordwine's *New System of Fortification.*	153
John Hopkins on Political Economy	159
Enharmonic Organ	165
Contre-Enquête	177
Lady Morgan's *Princess*	216
Jacquemont's *Letters from India*	239
Table-Talk of S. T. Coleridge	248
Mrs. Loudon's *Philanthropic Economy*	254
Woolhouse's *Essay on Musical Intervals, &c.*	290

Programmes to various Nos. to be found in their order.

APPENDIX.

Instrument of Exchange	295
Arabs and Persians	344
Prospects of the Coloured Races	406
Stuart's *Three Years in North America.*	416
Present Posture of Affairs	430
Banim's *Canvassing*	447
Extract from Article on *Military Law*	463
Extract from Article on *Sugar without Slavery*	464
Miscellaneous Extracts from Westminster Review	466

VOL. IV.

	Page
Sierra Leone.—1808	1
On Morals and Law.—1813	4
What is a Constitution?—1814	23
What is a Rightful Government?—1815	26
Treaty in Persian Gulph. 1820. (Copy in Arabic and English).	29
Correspondence on Slavery, &c. (Arabic and English)	40
Respective Values of a good and bad Harvest.—1830	44
Letter to Earl Grey on the Adjustment of the House of Peers.—1831	47
Letters of a Representative to his Constituents, during the Session of 1836	61
Do. during the Session of 1837	195
Collections of Addresses, &c. 1837—1840	303
Lectures on various subjects	365
The True Theory of Rent (Pamphlet republished)	399
Catechism on the Corn Laws (Pamphlet republished)	459
Mirage on a Heated Wall in Greenwich Park	580

VOL. V.

Letters to various Journals, between March 1840 and the end of the year

The Letters are orderly arranged, and the subjects stated in the running head at the top of each page.

VOL. VI.

Letters to various Journals, in the years 1841 and 1842	1
Addenda. Geometrical	433

ERRATA.

In Vol. I. p. 368, *line* 25, *for* nigh *read* high.

In Vol. II. p. 136, *line* 5, *for* Chapter XVII *read* Chapter XVIII.
p. 217, *last word, for* ou *read* no.
p. 224, head line, for *Supplement to Article on* read *Supplement to Article on Silk and Glove Trades.*

In Vol. III. p. 97, bottom line, for *Imprisonment* read *Impressment.*
p. 175, *line* 36, *for* inferrible *read* inferible.
p. 292, *line* 21, *for* useully *read* usefully.
p. 433, *line* 35, *dele* * *at the end.*

In Vol. IV. p. 63, *line* 2, *for* 1838 *read* 1836.
p. 309, *line* 21, *for* 1837 *read* 1838.

In Vol. VI. p. 67 *and p.* 90, two Letters to the *Editor of the Statesman* should be transposed; as is apparent from their dates.

END OF INDEX.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 January, 1829.

ART. I.—1. *Protestant Principles: Exemplified in the Parliamentary Orations of Royal Dukes, Right Reverend Prelates, Noble Peers, and Illustrious Commoners; with the Constitutional Declarations of Irish Protestants; against the Roman Catholic Claims. To which is prefixed, An Address to the Protestants of Great Britain and Ireland.* "NOLUMUS LEGES ANGLIÆ MUTARI." London. John Murray, Albemarle Street. 1827. 8vo. pp. 451.

2. *Speeches upon the Roman Catholic Claims: delivered in Parliament, by Charles Lord Colchester, in the House of Commons when Speaker, and subsequently in the House of Peers. With Preliminary Observations upon the present state of the Roman Catholic Question.* London. Hatchards. 1828.

3. *An Address to the Freeholders of the County of Kent. By the Right Hon. Lord Bexley. Oct. 25*, 1828. Maidstone. R. J. Cutbush.

4. *A Letter on Catholic Emancipation. By the Rev. R. W. Hamilton, of Leeds.* Liverpool. F. B. Wright. 1828.

A GOOD kind of man, but a stupid,—a substantial sort of a waggoner, who lived in a hard-working country, where he had enough to do to get his loads up one hill and down another, and make both ends meet at the year's end,—received from his father, who was just such a man as himself, and in fact as like him as eggs are to eggs, a fair stud of horses, fourteen black and six grey, all able-bodied beasts, and as likely to drag a broad-wheeled waggon through rut and mire, as could be met with in Europe, or America to boot. The cattle in the main, excepting their colour, were much alike. It is true they were of different breeds; and it was on record that the whole stud had once been grey, and when the black breed was first introduced, which was in the time of one of the present man's great-great-grandmothers of blessed memory, they were sorely kicked by the greys, who considered themselves as the orthodox colour,—and this went on, till by the course of nature and arithmetic, the kickers were proved to be in the wrong, when they were not a little kicked in their turn. Of late years how-

ever, the predominance of the blacks had been so decided, that the greys wanted nothing but to have fair play and be let alone; and except when intolerable ill-treatment roused them to momentary retaliation, there was no instance, as in fact was only common sense in man or horse, of their attempting anything against the peace of the community. Another difference, indeed, there existed, which was made great use of towards keeping up the old disputes. And this was, that there was a notion, that the greys could not do without a mash two days a week; and some old-fashioned keepers they had, laid great stress upon this point, though many thought if it was left to the cattle themselves, they would be very likely to be content with oats. But however this might be, the difference served for a difference, or for a peg to hang a difference upon; and fierce were the disputes, whether a horse that ate mash twice a week, ought to rank with a horse that ate oats whenever he could get them. One thing, however, was remarkable,—that these differences were never heard of when there was anything to do. And particularly in the great winter, when the good man's waggon got into such roads as were never known before or since,—and some said the drivers were drunk, and others that they must have been mad to get into such places at all, and that it was nothing but luck and a hard frost that ever got them out of the scrape,—there was nobody who did not allow, that the single way in which the waggon was ever brought into fair ground again, was that the horses laid shoulder to shoulder, without distinction of colours, and no man at that moment could have said, that a black was better than a grey, or that the waggon went any the worse whether mash or oats were helping to draw it. In fact, from that time, the owner, who paid for all, began to have a serious wish to see an end of disputes. And it was while he was thinking on this matter, and racking his brains for the means of bringing it to pass, that there happened what happened. And what this was, will be seen by those who go on with the history.

Now what fate had determined should happen, was, that as he was sitting and meditating as aforesaid, his landlord and the vicar of the parish, who were persons whose opinions his father had taught him to hold in great respect, came to him and told him, that they had considered his case as if it had been their own, and there was no peace nor salvation for him in any way but one—and that was, that he should hook on his six grey horses to the back of his waggon instead of the front, and so drag up the hills with fourteen pulling one way, and six the other. His progress, they said, depended on an ascendancy; and this, they told him, was an ascendancy, and consequently

the only thing that could do him good. It was in vain that the school-master urged,—for the school-master was abroad, and had got into that parish too, though it was a dull one,—that fourteen and six made twenty, and six from fourteen left eight; so that it was, in reality, making an eight-horse power out of a twenty, or throwing away nearly two-thirds. The other side said this was an abstract doctrine and a conceit of theory,—and that his ancestors, who must necessarily have been older than himself, had been seen pulling up hill in precisely the same manner;—and they gave as many reasons as would fill an octavo volume, why nothing else would do. So the honest man took the advice of his betters, as an honest man ought; and the next week his waggon was seen working up hill with six horses behind, in the extraordinary fashion his aristocracy insisted on. And to say the truth, the cattle that pulled backwards, exerted themselves to the utmost,—and made the fire fly from their heels, and their traces crack again, to show their discomfort; for they were angry at being dragged with their tails foremost after such an unbrotherly sort. And great was the commiseration for the unfortunate beasts that were made to go pulling up hill with their fellows yoked against them; and it was clear from their looks, that they thought they looked like fools,—but what was to be done when the gentlemen would have it so? And the more the boys holla'd, and called out 'Whip behind,' the more the drivers who were in the plot, huzza'd for the Black Ascendancy; and one of them swore 'So help him God'—for which he ought to have been fined—that he would never consent to any other method while breath was in his body. So in this way they went on, to the great mirth of some, and the admiration of all; and how it ended is not so clearly known; except that there was a design of bringing the plan before parliament, that the united wisdom might have the benefit of adopting it if they thought proper.

If any person is anxious to know what kind of arguments were brought against the school-master, he may apply himself to 'Protestant Principles, exemplified in the Parliamentary Orations of Royal Dukes, Right Reverend Prelates, Noble Peers, and Illustrious Commoners,' not written at all in mockery, but *bonâ fide* printed and published by John Murray of Albemarle Street. Here shall he find pregnant reasons, 'hallowed maxims,' 'fearless determination,' and 'unison of sentiment,'—all brought to bear on the necessity of applying the '*Nolumus leges Angliae mutari*,' to the case of the unhappy cattle who are at this time dragged behind the waggon of the state. The which, for brevity, the author of the 'Principles' has condensed into eight Propositions,—intended, as he declares, for the 'de-

monstration' of his case by 'incontrovertible facts' and 'allowed declarations.' Which Propositions here follow in the entire; with what the school-master would have replied, set opposite to each.

I. That the Protestants of Great Britain and Ireland [*meaning the black horses*] possess an acquired and inalienable right to political and religious ascendancy in the State. — *Protestant Principles, &c.* p. v.

Answer. They have an acquired and inalienable right to cut their own throats if they please; for they are a majority, and nobody can hinder them. But the question is, whether they are to be fools enough to cultivate such an ascendancy, as consists in dragging a third part of their fellows at their heels, instead of having their assistance in the common draught.

When the Catholics had an ascendancy of the same kind, they struggled hard to retain it; and when the Protestants got it in their turn, they did so too. But the modern discovery is, that it is not ascendancy but union, that will draw the waggon through the mire.

II. That the Roman Catholics, who recognize a foreign ecclesiastical jurisdiction within this realm, enjoy as many privileges, as it is expedient for a nation essentially Protestant to concede. —*Id.*

A. It is not true, that the nation is essentially Protestant any more than that the horses are essentially black; they are essentially fourteen black and six grey. It is a fraud and a fallacy to represent that a nation is essentially anything, except a combination of the people who compose it, whether they be Jew, Mohammedan, or Infidel. All pleas to the contrary, are only pleas for the exercise of oppression by the application of physical force.

The Catholics of Great Britain recognize an ecclesiastical jurisdiction vested in a foreigner, because their Pope happens to be the Pope of Rome, and not the Pope of Canterbury. But there is no proof that they will ever obey their Pope in opposition to their civil interests; but every proof to the contrary. Make them happy and contented citizens, and they will not be unhappy ones to please the Pope. The plea of their recognizing a foreign jurisdiction, therefore, is nugatory and dishonest, unless it can be shown, first, that some inclination to do mischief, in a state of justice and equality, is likely to arise from it,—and secondly, that they would have some power to do mischief supposing they had the inclination.

III. That the acquisition of political and religious power in the kingdom, is the manifest object of the Roman Catholics; and that, as similar power in possession of persons professing the same creed has been productive of baneful consequences in those states where existent, such power must therefore prove imminently detrimental to the welfare, peace, and happiness of this Protestant empire.—*Id.*

A. Power—political and religious power—is what all men seek for, and have a right to obtain in exact proportion to their numbers and importance in the state. Any state founded on other principles, is not a community associated for the common good, but a *caste* of bandits united for the oppression of such unfortunate persons of other classes as may happen to be within their reach.

That the Catholics abused their power when they had it, is as true as that the Protestants have abused theirs. But the discovery of modern civilization is, that instead of the question being whether Thomas shall be the robber or John, neither John nor Thomas shall rob the other, but each shall take the share that honestly befalls him.

If the question were of giving power to a *majority* of Catholics, the disposition of the Catholics to abuse power would be an important element in the debate. But when their minority is one of six to fourteen, the question is only whether we shall hook-on six horses behind, for a danger which is non-existent.

The real danger perceived by the supporters of injustice in the abstract, is, that the struggle between justice and injustice is already often so hard as to make it difficult for the latter to hold its ground. And as the Catholics, it is supposed, at least for the present, would be on the side of justice, there is no knowing what perils might arise from the accession of six out of twenty. The fear is not of what six millions of Catholics could do by themselves, but of what they might do if they were to join six or eight millions who are for justice already. As it used to be said that America was defended in Germany, so what is really defended by the opponents of the Catholics is *something else*—as, for instance, the state of the representation, or the Corn Laws. It is in this light, therefore, that every person in the empire, except those who profit by existing wrongs, has a home interest in the success of the Catholics.

IV. That the speeches and publications emanating from divers members of the Roman Catholic Association, and the public

A. The Roman Catholics do, as most other people do when they are oppressed, —they do all that they can. They may not always act with the best possible judgment; but men are not bound to be oppressed and judicious in the same

transactions of this *imperium in imperio*, are demonstrative of the unconstitutional course which Roman Catholics would pursue, if ever they possess, 'total, unqualified, and unconditional emancipation.' —*Id.*

breath. The oppressors do not know how to be judicious,—much less the oppressed.

When the Protestants found themselves in danger of being oppressed as the Catholics are now, they stood upon no niceties, but they whipt another king upon the throne, and kept him there. After this precedent, there is no sense in making an outcry because the Catholics associate to carry a point in parliament.

V. That, during the recent elections in Ireland, the Roman Catholic Priesthood exercised an inauspicious and undue influence over their flocks, and manifested symptoms of spiritual domination over their communicants, for the undisguised attainment of political purposes.—*Id.*

A. The Catholic priesthood did as the Methodist preachers, for instance, or any other priesthood, would do if their sect was oppressed—use all their influence to drive their flocks in the way they thought for the common interest. When Lord Sidmouth deemed fit to tamper with the Toleration Act, the Methodist preachers, in a week, sent up petitions to both Houses which would have reached to Charing Cross, and brought his lordship to a *μετάνοια* or change of mind before his next Sunday's dinner. It is impossible to say that any set of men have not a right to do the best they can for themselves, within the limits of what is allowed to all.

VI. That the Roman Catholic Forty-shilling Freeholders, having violated the original object which the legislature contemplated when conceding to this body the Elective Franchise, have therefore incapacitated themselves from being retained in possession of this privilege;—this portion of the Elective Franchise should consequently be remodelled, or the amount

A. When a man has the right of voting, it is either that he may use it for his own protection, or that he may not. If it is the first, then there can be no complaint against him for using it. If it is the other, then the whole is a mockery and a fraud, a novel invention of tyranny, for giving a man a right to vote *when it suits his oppressors.* If the people of England see the votes of the forty-shilling freeholders taken away for using them, then the vote of every man in England may be taken away for the same reason; election is become a puppet-show, and the House of Commons Punch and Judy.

All popular elections prove, that the

of freehold qualification increased.—*Id.* p. vi.

poorer classes are to a very great extent under the influence of the richer; which is as it ought to be. The forty-shilling freeholders have demonstrated, that there is a certain degree of personal oppression and injustice, at which the influence of the richer classes fails; which is also as it ought to be. It is because it is demonstrated that the possession of popular suffrage is in extreme cases an efficient instrument of protection, that it is proposed to take it away. The forty-shilling freeholders have read a lesson to the people of England on the effects of popular suffrage, which if the latter do not benefit by, they are duller than they were ever taken for. If the people of England see unmoved the Irish freeholders deprived of their freehold for using it, they sign the death-warrant of the little power they have to protect themselves, and of all their hopes of increasing it.

VII. That the wisest Statesmen, and most distinguished Protestants of the past age, were decidedly opposed to a 'total, unqualified, and unconditional' concession of the Roman Catholic claims.—*Id.*

A. There is no arguing from the time when the Protestants were struggling against oppression, to the time when they are the oppressors. When they were just escaping from the condition in which the Roman Catholics are now, there might be many things defensible and right, which are not so when the question is only of doing justice to a minority that asks it. The Revolution of 1688 was exactly such an event as would take place, if the Roman Catholics were to relieve themselves from oppression by an application to a foreign power. Whatever therefore the precedent may prove, it does not prove either the right or policy of oppressing anybody now.

VIII. That a preponderating majority of British and Irish peers, with a majority of British Representatives, being opposed to this misnamed 'Emancipation'—it is a measure which, being repugnant to the fundamental axioms of the British Constitution, and discordant with the inclinations

A. Everybody knows, that there will be no emancipation till a majority can be got for it; and to get it, is the question. In the Commons a majority has been had several times already. And in the House of Lords,—whose avowed constitutional object is to act as a drag upon the national will by the interposition of a body the least accessible to the reasons which move the rest,—there is no occasion to despair. Lords may not change, but lords must die and have successors; and in this way, sooner or later,

of the people, is therefore unsuitable, inexpedient, and unnecessary for this Protestant nation.—*Id.*

the opinions of the age will climb up into the fold. The *vis inertiae* of the hereditary body is evidently equal to some assignable quantity, and may be considered as equivalent to a demand for some given majority in the Commons. It is therefore only marching upon this point instead of the other. The point is a little farther off, but it is equally sure to be reached in the end.

Such are the eight Propositions—the strong distillation—the one glass in the middle of the frozen bottle of champagne, as Lord Byron has delighted to express it—wherein are condensed the reasons in which the opponents of the Catholics put their trust. From these the descent is easy to the grosser matter of the Orations themselves; of which the collection is so copious, that there is no room for premising more, than that in cases of this kind, the multiplicity of reasons is no argument for truth. Fallacies are as plenty as blackberries, on any subject where men's passions are engaged. The question, therefore, in any instance, is not how many reasons can be urged, but how many of them can stand the test of a reply.

Surely your lordships cannot wish to place the Established Church of England upon a worse footing than any other church within these realms; nor allow the Roman Catholics, who not only refuse to submit to our rules, but who deny any authority of the civil power over their church, to legislate for the Established Church; which must be the case if they be admitted to seats in either House of Parliament.—*Speech of H. R. H. the Duke of York; April* 25, 1825. p. 3.

A. 'Shall we suffer Catholics to legislate for the Established Church,' means 'Shall we suffer Catholics to sit in the 'Houses of Lords and Commons in proportion to their numbers and importance 'in the state.' If the question had been of transferring the legislation for the Established Church to a body wholly composed of Catholics, then the objection would have been just. But, as it is, it amounts only to saying, 'Shall we suffer 'anybody to sit in the Houses of Lords 'or Commons, that is not of the Church 'of England.'

Suppose the Catholics were to say, 'Shall we suffer Protestants to sit in 'either House of Parliament with us, 'and so legislate for the Roman Catholic 'Church.' What a proof of violence, and incapacity for constituting part of a civilized community, would this be held to be. Yet the blunder would be only the same as now;—and consists in overlook-

ing the fact, that barbarians divide themselves and go to buffets, to know which half shall oppress the other,—civilized men come to some middle term of justice, which combines the interests of all.

If the Established Church has some secret which makes her interests incapable of combination with those of anybody else, —she is a tyranny, and will go the way of other tyrannies. Those who say her interests are so incapable, say she is a tyranny; and the Church ought to bring her action for libel—though she will not.

My Lords.—I wish to ask, whether your lordships have considered the situation in which you might place the King, or whether your lordships recollect the oath which his Majesty has taken at the altar, to his people, upon his coronation? I beg, my lords, to read the words of that oath:—"I will, to the utmost of my power, maintain the laws of God, the true profession of the gospel, and the Protestant reformed religion established by law;—and I will preserve unto the bishops and clergy of this realm, and to the churches committed to their charge, all such rights and privileges as by law do or shall appertain to them, or any of them."—*Id.* p. 4.

A. The meaning of the oath is clearly that the king will not fall into the sin of James II,—that he will use the executive power for the preservation of the bishops, and everybody else, in their legal rights, whatever they may be, and not use it for taking them away contrary to law. But that it contemplates no constraint on the exercise of his portion of the *legislative* power, is demonstrated by the words 'as 'by law do or *shall.*' The word 'shall' contemplates alteration; and is specially put there to do so. But no alteration in the rights and privileges by law appertaining to the church, can take place without the co-operation of the king. The co-operation of the king in alterations, therefore, is contemplated. Surely, the church does not intend to maintain, that the king's Coronation Oath is a patent mousetrap,—destined to let all in, that may be for the advantage of the church and churchmen, and nothing out.

The confounding the king's maintenance of the law with keeping the law always in its existing state, is as absurd as if a man were to fancy that when he sings, drunk or sober, 'May *he* protect our laws,' it means, 'May *he* refuse his assent to the repeal of any Act of Parliament.' It is in the king's capacity of a commander of foot, horse, and dragoons, that he is to protect our laws; and not by the refusal to co-operate in his legislative capacity, in such alterations as may from time to time be found needful.

With respect, my lords, to the circumstances which brought our family to the British throne, your lordships well know that they originated in the Revolution. The great object of that revolution was to secure the religion and liberties of these realms. These objects were confirmed by the act of settlement, by the declaration of rights, by the oath of supremacy and abjuration, and by the succession to the crown in the Protestant line. To maintain and uphold all these, my lords, our family was called to the throne. And whatever can militate against these principles, in the remotest degree, it is my bounden duty, as a member of this family, and as a member of your lordships' House, to resist.—*Speech of H. R. H. the Duke of Cumberland, May* 10, 1805. —p. 6.

A. The Revolution of 1688 was the outbreak of an oppressed party, and setting it a-cock-horse on the oppressing one. It was such an operation as would be performed now, if the Catholics were to appeal to foreign aid, and set a new king of their own upon the throne. It might be necessary enough; at least all Protestants might think so. And under all the circumstances of the case, it might be the best thing that could be done; and we, the quondam sufferers, are much obliged to the doers. But all this forms no reason why the country should oscillate between the extremes of Catholic and Protestant oppression for ever. Men live in these days for other purposes, than being either Catholics or Protestants *par excellence;* and they want to see the pendulum let down gently, into something like a point of natural rest. They want, in short, to see the end of dragging six horses out of twenty behind.

With respect to myself also, I trust that I may stand in some measure excused for an early and prompt interposition against a measure, which, while it seems to impose upon a lord chancellor, who under the bill may be the only lay servant of the crown in Great Britain necessarily a Protestant, the peculiar duty of watching over Protestant interests, appears to me necessarily and obviously to bring all those interests into extreme peril.—*Speech of Lord Eldon, April* 17, 1821.—p. 8.

A. What are familiarly called Protestant interests, distinguish themselves into two kinds, the honest and the dishonest. The Protestants can have no honest interest, but in the establishment of general justice and equality; whatever interests therefore go against this, are of the dishonest.

My Lords.—That securities were neces-

A. The Catholics offer a security, so good, that Mr. Pitt in withholding the

sary, Mr. Pitt had always admitted; that they were necessary to secure the Protestant interest, and to quiet also the fears of the Protestant mind; but it had never yet been stated, and I presume, therefore, that no man had learnt from that great statesman—for my own part I never could learn—what securities were to be proposed, and how the Roman Catholic mind was to be conciliated, and the Protestant mind at the same time divested of its apprehensions.—*Id.* p. 10.

secret of his intended securities, may be suspected of having been a *mauvais plaisant*. They offer—their minority. They offer the impossibility that six horses, though possessed of all the devils that entered into the herd of swine, should devour and swallow up fourteen. The Protestant mind must be peculiarly accessible to fear, if it wants any greater security for its *honest* interests, than being stronger than the suppposed adversary in the proportion of seven to three.

It appears, then, my lords, from what passed at the Revolution, that our ancestors were satisfied that political power in any department of the state, in the hands of Papists, was inconsistent with the maintenance of a Protestant establishment. Upon the principle that, in a Protestant kingdom, political power should be placed in Protestant hands, the settlement then made was made. Upon this principle, the settlement then made has been continued from generation to generation; and the wisdom of the principle is in itself sufficient to account for the adoption and maintenance of that settlement, without reference to the dread of Popish plots, or apprehensions about Popish pretenders.—*Id.* p. 36.

A. It might be very reasonable that our Protestant ancestors should come to such a conclusion, at a time when there was a balance of strength, or more properly when the balance was against them. At all events it was as natural, as that the Catholics should come to a similar conclusion, *mutatis mutandis*, on the supposition that they were at this moment to repeat the manœuvre of the Protestants. But all this proves nothing as to the propriety and necessity of doing the same thing when there is *no* balance, and when the Protestants have the power all on their own side.

My Lords.—Demand has followed from time to time upon demand, and demand will follow from time to time upon demand, till nothing more can be

A. Demand will follow upon demand, till the point of justice is arrived at;—there is no doubt of that. The enemies of justice are always in a ridiculous dilemma, between the necessity they feel for yielding something now, and the certainty that this will lead to yield-

asked; for till toleration of the Roman Catholics in Ireland gives way to Roman Catholic establishment, and Protestant establishment shall be succeeded by such a portion of toleration of Protestants as the Roman Catholics may be disposed to allow them, it cannot be rationally expected that the Roman Catholics there will cease their struggles to supplant the Protestant Church, if they do not disturb the settlement of property.—*Id.* p. 40.

ing more hereafter. They have their choice between perishing by a convulsion, and by a galloping consumption.

But the statement is utterly illusive, that demand will follow demand till the Protestants are reduced to as bad a state as the Catholics are in at present. Such a result would be the natural consequence of a revolution effected by foreign aid; but it is not what can ever be arrived at by the process of rational concession. The question is not of what the Catholics might be disposed to ask if they could get it; but of what they are likely to get by asking. There must be some chance, some probability, of their being able to obtain what they demand,—before their disposition to demand is represented as the measure of the danger.

Let the words of Lord Hardwicke be had in remembrance:—'It well deserves,' he says, 'the serious 'attention of the whole 'nation, of what im-'portant consequence 'it is, to preserve not 'only the name and 'outward form of the 'Protestant [religion] 'among us, but the 'real uniform belief 'and practice of it.'—*Id.* p. 43.

A. The old devil of 'uniformity,'—that lighted the fires of the Inquisition, and set Claverhouse on his black charger. It needs no conjuror to tell who is threatened, when such a spirit as this walks abroad with a licence from the lord chancellor.

The truth,—established, as every other truth must be, on the evidence of reiterated experiment—is, that in proportion as approximation has ever been made to uniformity—or, in other words, as a great and decisive preponderance has been given to one class of religious opinions over the others collectively,—exactly in the same proportion have been multiplied the sufferings of mankind;—and that the true Euthanasia of religious dissension, the very bond of peace and of all quietness, is in the Thousand-and-One sects, whereof none shall be before or greater than another.

It is as an approach is made to this last state and not to the other, that a majority is ever tame and tolerable. This is a truth palatable to no majority; but as all cannot be the majority, it is very good for all.

I admit—no man can dream of denying

A. The Roman Catholics believe, that an old gentleman elected in a particular

it—that all subjects in a free state are entitled to the enjoyment of equal rights upon equal conditions; but then the qualification of this principle in the case of the Roman Catholics is clear—the Roman Catholics who demand these equal rights, do not afford equal conditions.

My Lords.—The difference is this—it is stated in a moment,—the Protestant gives an entire allegiance to his Sovereign, the Roman Catholic a divided one.—*Speech of the Earl of Liverpool, May* 17, 1825.—p. 46.

way at Rome, is in spiritual matters the head of the Roman Catholics all over the world; and that they must either acknowledge him as such, or cease to be Roman Catholics. The Methodists believed much the same with respect to John Wesley; but nobody thought of espying the divided allegiance. Unless it can be shown, first, that there is any danger of the Catholics, or the Methodists, being put upon designs incompatible with the safety of the community, by the ecclesiastical superiors they chuse to make for themselves,—and secondly, that their numbers give them any chance of accomplishing such designs if they possessed them,—the depriving them of the enjoyment of equal rights on pretence of these peculiarities, is a cruel *non sequitur*, of the same nature as if the oppression of the negroes was defended on the ground that they did not comply with the condition of an equal length of nose.

What chance the Popish part of a man's allegiance has of carrying the day against his English or *un*-Popish adherence to his civil interest, is demonstrated by the fact, that when all England was Popish together, the Pope could not hold his own, nor prevent his affairs from coming to the pass in which they are discovered at present.

The service of the former is complete; that of the latter only qualified; and unless it can be proved to me, that the man who works for half a day is entitled to as much wages as the man who works the whole day, or, in other words, that the half is equal to the whole, I cannot admit, that the Roman Catholic, whose allegiance is divided between a spiritual and a temporal master, is entitled to the enjoyment of the same civil rights and privileges as the Protestant, whose allegiance is undivided, and who acknowledges but one ruler.—*Id.* p. 47.

A. The fallacy is in stating, that there *is* any difference in the services. The difference stated is only 'leather and prunella.' It would be just as sensible to say that one of the grey horses has his 'allegiance divided between a spiritual 'and temporal master,'—when the fact before everybody's eyes is, that he pulls and is willing to pull, if people will only refrain from yoking him to the wrong end.

Do not Protestants and Roman Catholics, however differing on other matters, unite in this, that in the various counties in Ireland, the power of the landlord is nothing to that which the priest possesses in cases of contested elections, and upon other occasions, when he wishes to make his political influence available?—*Id.* p. 51.

A. When the interests of the people and those of the priest lie the same way—when both of them are suffering under one common injustice—the priest has a power in rousing and directing the efforts of the people, against which the naked pecuniary influence of the landlord is as nothing. The case is the same that would take place, if the Protestant population of England were oppressed by the Roman Catholics, and Catholic landlords should try their hand at persuading them to vote against their clergy and their interest. In such circumstances the Protestant clergy would be 'brought to the fore,' and be of incalculable power; though on all common occasions they are ready enough to lament the little heed that is paid to their suggestions. It is not the priests that raise the storm, but the storm that raises the priests. In all countries, priests—'black, white, and grey'—confess themselves much fallen into the sere and yellow leaf. Even in Portugal, the priests could not hold their ground in opposition to the people, if the English Tories had not enabled the barbarian powers to press on France, to press on Spain, to press on Portugal, and so maintain them. The first time a timber slips in this 'House that Jack built,' it will be seen if it is not true.

The landlords have the Corn Laws; what else would they desire? Do they claim a monopoly of religion and quartern loaves,—the prohibition of foreign faith as well as corn, by act of parliament? Their demand to limit men's religion in Ireland, is the outpost to their demand to limit men's food in other places; and to drive them from one first, is the plain road to driving them from the other afterwards.

I am not prepared, by my vote this night, to give notice to quit my present tenement, until I am sure of having another house over my head.—*Speech of Earl Bathurst, May* 16, 1817.—p. 70.

A. There is one thing worse than having no new house over your head,—and that is, having the old one fall upon it. The question may some morning be found settled in a way that it would be very unpleasant for noble lords to think upon; and what then becomes of noble lords' coquetries, about not trying a new house too hastily?

On this head also,

A. This was said in 1822; and in

in addition to the enactments of our present laws, we shall do well to bear in mind the plain policy and express provision of the famous edict of Nantes, which forbids the public exercise of any other than the dominant religion in our fleets and armies, a possible attempt in the present growth of Roman Catholic pretensions, and which no man who values the safety of the state, can contemplate without just alarm.—*Speech of Lord Colchester, June* 21, 1822.—p. 74.

1828 the king's generals in Ireland were issuing directions, that when the Protestant and Catholic soldiers of a regiment attended their respective places of public worship at different hours, the Protestants should keep the arms of the regiment for the Catholics, and the Catholics for the Protestants. A good military comment on the wisdom of intolerant peers; and an argument for the soundness of the rest of their conclusions.

Our Protestant ascendancy must be paramount, or we shall have, in no long time, a Catholic domination. Let us not deceive ourselves. These two claims to power are utterly incompatible, and irreconcilable.—*Id.*—p. 76.

A. The tyrant's plea, necessity. If by ascendancy is meant the foolish plan of making one part of the horses drag the other, then it is true that there must always be an ascendancy one way, and that the only way to prevent its being against one side, is to make it against the other. But this necessity rests on nothing but the supposition, that men are foolish enough to insist on there being ascendancy instead of union.

A conference was held respecting the bill for Occasional Conformity, and the lords who conducted it, had objected to a measure which subjected to the penalty of perpetual forfeiture of office, those who were guilty of the crime of occasional conformity. At the conference they stated this important doctrine: 'The lords 'look on the fixing of 'the qualifications for 'places of trust to be 'a thing so entirely

A. The legislature may have a right to exclude from places of trust to which the appointment is with itself; but it has not a right to exclude from the *legislature*, for if it does this, it vitiates the source from which just legislation must proceed. If a number of merchants form a joint-stock company, they have a right to determine by a majority, if they can do so, that they will not employ a broker that is a Jew. But they have not a right to determine by a majority that the Jews in the joint-stock shall have no votes, lest they should give them to a Jew. The first is a legitimate exercise of the power that must be in all majorities. The other is an effort to compass and preserve a majority, of the same nature as if an existing majority in the

'lodged within the legislature, that, without giving any reason for it, upon any apprehension of danger, however remote, every government may put such rules, restraints, or conditions on all who serve in any place of trust, as they shall see cause for; but penalties and punishments are of another nature.'—*Parliamentary History*, vol. vi. p. 80.—*Speech of Mr. Peel, Feb.* 28, 1825.—p. 89.

House of Commons should proceed to secure themselves, by voting that the minority be forthwith expelled the House.

The Roman Catholics do fully admit, that they shall lie under all manner of incapacities, which a legislature constituted upon principles of justice, shall see fit to lay upon them. But they assert, that there is no justice in excluding them from their share in that legislature; and that to confound the two things together, is a fraud.

Mr. Pitt told the House—'The persons 'excluded by the Test 'Laws laboured under 'no kind of stigma; 'but it was the policy 'of private life, not 'to allow any man to 'manage your affairs, 'whose principles you 'did not like; but the 'exclusion of Dissenters could be looked 'upon as no punishment.'—*Id.* p. 91.

A. The fallacy is in the word '*your*.' They are not '*your* affairs;' they are 'your's and the other's together.' The intention is to argue in a circle,—'The 'affairs are our's, and therefore we exclude *you;* we exclude *you*, and therefore the affairs are our's.'

If the members of the House of Commons chuse to determine that they will not have a Dissenter for their Speaker, or for chairman of a committee, they have a right to do it, and nobody can hinder them. But if by way of effecting this, they say they will expel the Dissenters from the House, it becomes quite another thing, and everybody knows what to think of it.

This was the interpretation of the treaty by the Whigs of that period; and what says the Whig historian? Bishop Burnet says—'And thus ended the 'war of Ireland; and 'with that our civil 'war came to a final 'end. The articles 'of capitulation were 'punctually executed, and some doubts that arose out of some ambiguous words, were explained in favour of the Irish.'

A. The Whigs of that day are the very persons against whom suspicion lies, and therefore the last whose evidence should be brought in their own behalf. It is an odd fallacy that would neutralize the opinions of the friends of the Catholics *now*, by the opinions of their enemies a hundred and forty years ago, because both happen to rejoice in the name of Whigs.

I take, then, Sir, my meaning of the first article of the treaty

of Limerick from the interpretation put on it by King William III.—I take it from the interpretation put on it by the Whigs of that time—and I take it from the Whig historian; and by them all it is held to mean, not political power or privileges, but freedom of religious worship. On this ground, then,—on these authorities—on Whig authorities, too—I feel myself bound to dissent from the assertions of the honourable baronet who opened this question.—*Speech of Mr. Peel, March* 5, 1827.—p. 105.

And my right honourable friend, the Attorney-General for Ireland, (Plunkett) appealed to the House, as English gentlemen, if the people of England were, like the Roman Catholics of Ireland, excluded from political power, if they would not rise in arms for the recovery of their rights, and if they would not think themselves *justified* in rising in arms (hear),—aye, *justified* in the act of rising in arms against the laws; or, if they did not, if they would not think themselves unworthy of the name of Englishmen.

A. The monstrous and abominable doctrine, that the people of England would think themselves justified in rising in arms, if they were excluded from political power like the Roman Catholics! But what says history,—what says the evidence of facts? That all the people of England have of settled government, is founded on the daily and hourly acknowledgment, that they *are* justified in rising in arms to prevent their being excluded like the Catholics. If not, why do not the sentries move off from the Horse Guards, and send for the king of Sardinia?

And, Sir, those gentlemen who advance these doctrines, which, above all, excite my apprehensions, do it, while they pronounce the exalted names, and profess to act on the principles of Mr. Pitt and Mr. Burke, who would have been the first to oppose such monstrous, such abominable doctrines—(cheers).—*Id.* p. 106.

'With regard,' Mr. Pitt said, 'to the admission of Roman 'Catholics to franchises, to the elective franchise, or to 'any of those posts 'and offices which 'have been alluded 'to, I view all these 'points as distinctions 'to be given, not for the sake of the person and the individual who is 'to possess them, but for the sake of the public, for whose benefit

A. Let the whole consider what is best for the whole; but do not drive out a part from their share in the debate. It is precisely the difference between a majority's hearing a minority and deciding their own way after all,—and their obtaining their purpose by decreeing that the minority shall be expelled.

'they were created, and for whose advantage they are to be exercised. 'In all times, therefore, Sir, and upon every occasion, (continued 'Mr. Pitt,) whether relating to the Roman Catholic or Protestant 'Dissenter, to the people of Ireland, or to the people of England, I 'have always, from a due regard to the Constitution, been of opinion, 'that we are bound to consider, not merely what is desired by a part, 'but what is best and most advantageous for the whole.'—*Id.* p. 108.

This,—(continued the right honourable Secretary,)—this, Sir, is the principle on which I support the exclusion of the Roman Catholics (cheering). I would not make the Roman Catholic faith, or the religious opinions of any man, a ground of exclusion against him merely on their account; *but, Sir, I am bound to consider, not only what they may suffer and what they may desire, but what will be good for the whole.*—*Id.* p. 109.

A. The passage put in Italics conveys a perfectly good reason for a Protestant member's conducting himself in a certain manner *in an open parliament;* but not for commencing his operations by voting the Catholic minority out of the House.

I object, Sir, however, to the declaration contained in this petition, that it disagrees with the declaration sent forth by the Roman Catholic clergy. They state, that they publish it 'in the simplicity of truth, as the doctrines of the Catholic Church had been frequently misunderstood or misrepresented.' In the declaration published, in 1826, it is stated, that 'the Catholic 'Church, in common 'with all Christians, 'receives and respects 'the entire of the ten 'commandments, as 'they are found in 'Exodus and Deuter-'onomy; the only

A. There can be no mistake in believing, that this is an averment that the Roman Catholics 'do not recognize the 'second commandment, but exclude it 'from their Catechism,'—and that they have been guilty of 'insincerity and an 'attempt to mislead,' by their declaration that they 'in common with all Chris-'tians, receive and respect the entire of 'the ten commandments as they are 'found in Exodus and Deuteronomy.'

Now see what quantity of accuracy and research is displayed, in the charge thus brought forward by a minister of state, as a reason for excluding many millions of the community from the benefit of equal laws.

What the Church of England prints in *two* paragraphs, under the titles of the first and second commandments, the Catholics and Lutherans print in *one*, and call the first. And they do it, they say, 'because it all relates to one and the 'same thing,'—the 'graven things' being only an explanation of what is

'difference between 'them lying in some 'points of construc- 'tion.' When I first read this passage, I exclaimed, 'Then I, 'and many other Pro- 'testants, have been 'long in error, for I 'have always under- 'stood that the Ro- 'man Catholics did 'not recognize the se- 'cond commandment, 'but excluded it from 'their Catechism.'

But, Sir, it happened soon afterwards that a catechism of the Roman Catholic Church fell into my hands, and then I was able to appreciate the 'simplicity of truth' in which they had issued their declaration. This catechism, from which I am now about to read, is stated to have been revised by the Rev. Dr. Butler, and recommended by four Roman Catholic Archbishops; it is printed by the Roman Catholic printer to the Royal College of Maynooth, and is the twenty-fifth edition, carefully corrected. No doubt, Sir, therefore, can be attached to its authenticity. I turn to the Commandments, to correct my erroneous conceptions of the Roman Catholic system, and I find, that indeed meant by 'strange gods;' and they assert that the authority for it is as old as St. Augustine.

What the Church of England prints in *one* paragraph, and calls the tenth commandment, the Catholics and Lutherans print in *two*, under the titles of the ninth and tenth. And they do it, they say, because one prohibits the desire to break the sixth commandment, and the other the seventh,—and because they consider this as a more feasible distinction than the other. It is true they disturb the order of the Hebrew; but they think their reason sufficient to authorize it.

The Catholics *have* no composition under the exclusive title of 'their Catechism,' as the Church of England has; but on the contrary a multitude of works, the offspring of the zeal of different ecclesiastics, resembling in diversity of style and temperament, the elucidations of the Church of England's Catechism which are from time to time put forth by various divines. Some of these—amounting in the specimens collected to one in four—give only the heads of the commandments, on the ground of their being what are called 'short catechisms;' and in these, in consequence of the arrangement described, the words 'graven things' do not appear in sequence to the words 'strange gods.' But these shorter catechisms equally discuss the question of whether it is proper to 'pray to and serve images;' and even quote the remaining words of the commandment, though not in the precise place where the objector chuses to require them.

Upon such *lana caprina* as this, a minister of state declares his conviction of the necessity of harnessing the six horses to the rear; and men in the capacity of legislators, if the report is correct, receive him with loud cheering.—'The

the first Commandment is, in some respects, differently expressed, as compared with its appearance in Exodus and Deuteronomy. The second is 'Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain;' and the number ten is made out in this manner,—the ninth is, 'Thou 'shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife,' and the tenth, 'Thou shalt not 'covet thy neighbour's goods.' It would be infinitely better, Sir, and much more to my satisfaction, if my right honourable friend had not called my attention to this petition. And I cannot help regretting this additional proof of the incompatibility of the fact with the profession of the Roman Catholic Church, and that my first suspicion was correct, viz.—that these petitioners *did not* approach the House 'in the simplicity of truth.'

established pea-green slippers,' is a reasonable cause of quarrel, compared with that of the Secretary for the Home Department.

After this, Sir, let not my right honourable friend, for the future, challenge implicit confidence for any petition which he may present from that quarter. Whatever statements may accompany it, I shall regard them with suspicion. Their professed sentiments I, for one, must continue to contrast with their actual conduct: and in opposition to this sort of test, it is in vain to refer me to this or that letter from Dr. Doyle, or the declaration of Dr. Curtis, when some other letter, or some other declaration, from the same party, might be adduced, of a totally opposite character. They will never again mystify me. And I cannot avoid expressing my participation in that feeling of disgust, which insincerity and attempts to mislead always excite in the minds of the English people.' (Loud cheering.)—*Id.* p. 125.

This, Sir, is the system upon which I have attempted to act with regard to Ireland. I have, on all occasions, endeavoured to do justice, and to give them the advantage of every privilege to which they are admissible by law.—*Id.* p. 128.

A. Law is not justice; it only ought to be. The very point in dispute is, whether the laws are just.

The right honourable Secretary, it is stated, 'concluded amidst loud and enthusiastic cheering.' So would he if he had spoken in favour of the Corn Laws, or any other of the vested interests. If it is within the province of a Review to criticize parliamentary oratory when it appears in print,—the eloquence of the Home Secretary may be characterized, as being the rhetoric of a picker of small holes,—a speech-maker upon *nauci, flocci, pili*,—an embalmer of other men's blunders, with a sprinkling of his own,—a political *ci-devant jeune homme*, who has contrived to preserve the rawness, artifice, and insipidity,

of what in the Pittite times was denominated 'a promising young man in the House of Commons.'

One fact is beyond the possibility of doubt. The Protestants are put on their defence. They have been reluctantly placed in that situation—they are the parties accused—they are charged with every species of intolerance, of religious bigotry, of oppression; and these charges are preferred against them by the Roman Catholic portion of the community and their advocates.—*Speech of Sir John Copley, March* 5, 1827.—p. 133.

A. Most people who are put on their defence, are reluctantly placed in that situation. And it ordinarily happens, because they are accused. As a lawyer, the Master of the Rolls might have spared the tautology.

What *is* bigotry? What *is* intolerance? What *is* oppression?

Bigotry, is not the believing that one kind of religion is true and another is not; or that one kind is better than another. This is the insidious sense; palmed on the world for the sake of confounding the absence of bigotry with indifference. But bigotry is believing that we have a right to rob and injure those who differ from us in religion. It is the believing that difference in religious opinions removes the obligation of the moral rule, to 'do to others as we would they should do to us.'

Intolerance, is bigotry in action. The two things stand to one another in the relation of 'faith and works.'

Oppression, is every violence inflicted by a potential majority on the minority, which is not justified by the consideration of the common good. Dragging six horses out of twenty behind, is not for the common good; it therefore is oppression.

When it is said 'the Protestants' are put on their defence, it means the *dishonest* Protestants. The black sheep have no right to hide themselves in the flock and say 'We are all mutton alike.'

What is it that the Roman Catholics of Ireland ask? Indeed they do not condescend to ask, but in terms the most emphatic and peremptory—in the language of menace, they demand of us what they

A. It is not the Roman Catholics of Ireland that ask. It is the sane part of the people of England; founding their claim on the dictates of common sense, and the plain rules of justice, which are always the rules of sound policy in the end. The truth will be told—THE PEOPLE OF ENGLAND ARE NOT WITH THE OPPRESSORS. They say they will not

call the restoration of their rights—their unconditional restoration.—*Id.* p. 151.

have a civil war in Ireland, for the sake of fattening those they do not want to be fat. The people on this side the water have not forgotten Jefferies and Kirke, and Lauderdale and Dalzell; and they will not see their rule restored in the Westland provinces. The very whiskered dragoon at Ballinamore*, said he did not like 'going out against the hill-folk.' It might do for Portugal, but it will not do for England, to have a gown-and-cassock war, lest a man should find his way to vote, that the emoluments of the rich churchmen are five times greater than they ought to be. In the country of the beloved Ferdinand, men may be found to turn out for the priesthood; but the people of England will not fight in such a cause, —they positively are not fools enough. They will not go to war with the Irish, for the sake of what is to be got by oppressing them. To reduce the strength of undue power, is what they want themselves. Nine-tenths of the people of England have no voice or influence, directly or indirectly, in the government; and the consequence is, they are made to keep the others. The whole manufacturing interest is made to keep the agricultural one, because it is cut off from its due share in the representation. What all these, therefore, as sensible men, are bound to say to the Irish, is '*You* help *us*, and *we* help *you*.' The struggle for fairness of representation in Ireland, is only the cause of the people of England tried under Irish names; and they are waiting for the decision of this question, before they proceed to their own.

Who is it that ever profits by oppression? Is it not always a pitiful minority? And why are you and I and everybody, to go to expense and suffering, for the sake of securing the profits of oppression to a pitiful minority? Will it comfort us under an invasion of the tax-gatherer,—or for a son or brother left buried in a bog in Ireland,—to hear that it was for the interest of the church establishment? Half the people in England dislike the church establishment; and three-fourths of the remainder care nothing about it. The people of England want to live and to let live; and have no notion of being hounded away to cut the throats of their brethren in a civil war, for the sake of preserving the Irish clergy from the danger of being asked unpleasant questions in parliament.

In the first place, *A.* The Constitution, in the mouths of

* True. A comrade who was there, wrote so to the author.—*Added in* 1839.

Sir, about what subjects are we in the habit of consulting in Parliament? What says the King's writ under the authority of which the House is convoked? We are summoned to consult on things and matters relating to the Constitution, and safety of the Protestant Church. By the measure now proposed, we are required to admit into the legislature of the country, assembled to deliberate upon matters connected with the safety of the Church of England, a body of Roman Catholics, directly hostile to that Church—men who, upon principle, must be hostile to it in every respect.—*Id.* p. 153.

A. Arguments of this kind amount to an avowal, that the Church of England is unpopular, and cannot be supported but by confining the exercise of government to her friends;—that if the power of interference were in the nation at large, she would be pulled down;—in other words, that the nation in the aggregate is her enemy. The policy of such avowals may be doubted; but those who call themselves her friends are answerable.

Now, Sir, I will entreat the House to recollect — and it is with sincere regret that I do so—that there are at the present moment, and have always been, many Protestant members of the House of Commons, who entertain views, and profess sentiments, of a nature hostile to those who have any evil to defend, always means *existing wrongs*. It clearly means so here. The question is at once brought into a short compass,—Whether parliament assembles to discuss the interests of the community, or the interests of the Church of England and existing wrongs.

the Established Church of these realms. If, in addition to the lukewarm friends, and avowed opponents, we throw into the scale another weight—if we add to this body another mass,—knowing as we do, that both will act with the same spirit, and make one common cause, shall we, I ask, be discharging our duty to the Church, of which we are members, and which we have pledged ourselves and are bound to support?—*Id.* p. 155.

A. What is this but saying, that the Church of England has no chance of standing, except by preventing the talents of her opponents from having a hearing;—that half-a-dozen men in the House of Commons as clever as the Attorney-General for Ireland, would talk her down in a twelvemonth? Now if she is as

Let me pause for a moment, Sir, upon this part of the subject, and let me suppose that there are returned to this House some of those persons who exhibit in themselves specimens of

some of those talents, which seem to be indigenous to Ireland—let me suppose some of the individuals of that body to be desirous of overturning the Protestant Establishment, and of rearing in its stead the Roman Catholic religion in Ireland—let me suppose these persons possessed of talents, resembling in their extent and power those of my right honourable friend the Attorney-General for Ireland, commanding and swaying the body they represent by their masterly eloquence and extraordinary powers, and directing that eloquence and those powers to the object to which I have referred. I ask, is this a light danger, and are we to treat it with contempt; or, are we not, to reserve in our own hands the most effectual means of defending ourselves from such a danger?—*Id.* p. 156.

rickety as this, what chance is there of her standing at all?—the scale is turned against her, and men will begin to take the rising side.

With this mass of information, Sir, it will not be difficult to discover the exact effect which the Roman Catholic disabilities produce upon the Roman Catholic population; and I was greatly surprised to hear from such competent witnesses as Mr. O'Connell, Dr. Doyle, and Dr. Kelly, how very little the great body of the people is affected by the disqualifying laws. That the greatest wretchedness exists amongst them, is beyond doubt; that poverty, that want of employment, insubordination, distrust in all the established institutions of the country, fraud, perjury, and immorality, arising from that distrust, exist to a frightful extent, is beyond

A. The way to discover 'the exact effect,' is to see what the effect would be on the Protestant population of England, if they were put into the place of the Roman Catholics, and the Roman Catholics into theirs.

The people of England would then not be long in finding out, that such an oppression had exactly the effect of the distinction of colours arising out of the existence of slavery in the West Indies;—that it penetrated into all ranks and relations of life;—that it met the rich in the enjoyment of his riches, and the poor in the endurance of his poverty;—and that to twaddle about its removal not removing all ills and filling up all wants, is like urging that the abolition of negro slavery would not give every man of colour an annuity in the three per cents. Like the negroes, they would say, 'Take off 'the unjust distinction that presses on us 'like a red-hot iron; and then leave us to 'take care of ourselves. We do not ask 'you to remove our wretchedness, but 'our degradation. We come for justice, 'not for charity. We complain that we 'are slaves, not that we are paupers.'

When men 'distrust all the established

all doubt; but that Roman Catholic emancipation is the cure for these evils, or one which is regarded by the peasantry in any other light than the gratification of religious bigotry, is what these gentlemen have not ventured to assert.—*Speech of George Robert Dawson, Esq. M.P. for Derry, April* 19, 1825.—p. 166.

But, Sir, when I consider the position of the two parties; when I consider the declarations which have been made, and the signs which have been given, I can never expect that the two parties will amalgamate together. The Protestants are in possession of all that is valuable in Ireland; their estates, no matter whether rightly or wrongfully, have been wrested from the Roman Catholics. The establishments of the country conferring emolument and honour, are all Protestant; the Church conferring a splendid provision upon its ministers, and the corporations giving station and power and influence to its members, are all Protestant, and have all, at no distant period, been in possession of Roman Catholics.—*Id.* p. 172.

A. It is admitted here distinctly, that the contest is for 'the possession of all 'that is valuable in Ireland,'—for 'the 'estates that, no matter whether rightly 'or wrongfully, have been wrested from 'the Roman Catholics,'—for the 'emo-'lument and honour' arising out of 'the 'establishments of the country,'—for the 'splendid provision' of the church, and the 'station and power and influ-'ence' of the corporations. In short that the Protestants in Ireland hold a great mass by occupation, which nobody pretends can bear looking into; and that to preserve them from the remote chance of such an accident, the people of England must enter into a civil war.

Is it possible therefore to think, Sir, that all the solid advantages can be on one side, without exciting a hope of enjoyment on the other? Can Protestants and Roman Catholics really institutions of their country,' there is but one inference,—that the institutions do them harm. To blame them for it, is as irrational as to blame them for complaining when a shoe pinches. It is the shoe, not the man, that wants altering.

A. The upshot of all this is to ask, whether any set of men will be wronged if they can help it. The argument is founded entirely on the wrongs being palpable and notorious, and on the certainty that no man submits to a wrong longer than he is obliged to do it.

The answer of the English people to

unite together when such tempting objects are open to the Roman Catholics, and when a public clamour has already been begun against the Protestants? Will the Roman Catholic be satisfied to see every Protestant institution rolling in wealth and splendour, whilst his own are in poverty and distress? Will he submit to have his churches, his convents, his schools, his colleges, supported by alms, whilst his Protestant rival revels in the enjoyment of Roman Catholic possessions? Human nature forbids us to think so; and I must do the Roman Catholics the justice to say, that they have been no hypocrites on this occasion, but have proclaimed boldly and naturally their expectations.—*Id.*

this must be, that they were not made to be bottle-holders to the Irish Protestants, in a struggle which is avowed to be unjust. That they will not let the Irish Protestants be trodden to pieces in the crowd; but will not be made a cat's-paw, to prevent a fair hearing of the case against them in the House of Commons.

What is it to the people of England, that an Irish Protestant shall 'revel in the enjoyment of Roman Catholic possessions,' and be able to oppress three out of four of all the men he meets? And why is an Englishman to pay in his purse or his person, for upholding such a state of things? Englishmen pay enough for upholding different kinds of slavery already. They pay upon every spoon-full of sugar they eat, for upholding the flogging of women in Jamaica; and there is no reason why they should pay for oppression in Ireland besides.

The object of the petition, my lords, couched in very decent and moderate terms, is, nevertheless, of great size and importance. It is no less than a request on the part of the Roman Catholics, to legislate for a Protestant country, to dispense the laws, to command the armies and navies, and to take share in the executive councils of a Protestant kindom: a request that strikes at the principles of the

A. Their request is not to legislate, but to have their share in legislation;—it is not in a Protestant country, but in a country that is part Protestant and part Catholic;—it is not to dispense the laws, but to be a portion of the dispensers;—it is not to command the armies and navies, but to have a share in the command where nobody objects that they shall fight. The fallacy throughout, is in confounding a demand for a just share, with a demand for the whole.

Revolution, and by plain, broad, and inevitable consequences calls into question the justice and policy of the Act of Settlement.—*Speech of the Archbishop of Canterbury, May* 13, 1805.—p. 201.

I insist, my lords, that I am as sincerely attached to the genuine principles of toleration as any one of your lordships. I consider it as the brightest ornament and fairest grace of the Reformed Church which is established in this kingdom: but I cannot prevail upon myself to confound toleration with equality, much less with power and eventual superiority. —*Id.*

A. Nobody confounds toleration with equality;—for the great question is, why there should be toleration and not equality. Toleration is the condescension of a prudent despot, who yields one half to secure the other. And the difficulty afloat in men's minds is, why there should be a despot at all;—what reason can be given for it, that may not be given for the despotism of any collection of men who are able to overpower a traveller on the high road.

If, after everybody is heard, the majority come to a determination that is disagreeable to the minority, there is no help for it but in the gradual developement of the truth, that all injustice is unprofitable in the end. But what is called for here is, that people shall suffer *and shall not be heard;* and that the reason why they shall not be heard is, that if they were heard they would cease to suffer.

But, my lords, let us examine the meaning of those words, 'debarred of their civil,' or as some have said, 'their natural rights.' Is there any civil right which individual citizens may not be called upon to forego, if public expediency demands the sacrifice? Is not this a principle, which, in some shape or other, must be recognized under every imaginable form of civil government?—*Speech of the Bishop of Chester, May* 17, 1825.—p. 210.

A. The proof lies upon the '*if.*' But what is attempted to be proved in this case, is only that it is expedient for the church and the Irish Protestants.

It seems to me, my lords, I confess, to be as unjust, in the abstract, to exclude a man from the legislature for want of a certain amount of pro-

A. Propping one rotten thing by another. Nobody believes that the exclusions from the legislature here appealed to, are anything but the trick of one party to carry things their own way.

But besides this, there may be no jus-

perty, as it is, to hold him disqualified, on account of certain opinions which affect the integrity and security of the commonwealth. —*Id.*

tice in the comparison. The exclusion from parliament for want of property, may be one that very little affects the class professed to be excluded; or it may be one that in practice is evaded, and amounts to no exclusion at all. Make it as easy for a Catholic to get into parliament, as for a man who has not 300*l.* a-year in land; and the Catholics will be content.

The oath and declaration, my lords, which it is the object of these bills to repeal, were intended to exclude Roman Catholics from offices of trust and profit, because the principles of their church were held

A. Bad logic, even without contesting any of the premises. For it omits the principal element, which is, whether the *times and circumstances* are such, as to make the exclusion as necessary now, as at the enactment of the oath and declaration.

to be inconsistent with the safety and tranquillity of the State. My lords, those principles are precisely the same now, as they were at the enactment of the oath and declaration; it is the boast of that church that they are so. Persons, therefore, professing those principles, are as inadmissible to offices of trust and profit now, as they were formerly.—*Speech of the Bishop of Salisbury, July* 9, 1823.—p. 226.

With my countrymen, my lords, I most decidedly concur; but, at the same time, feel it necessary to stand forward as an advocate of emancipation, though not exactly for the description of persons who have been for so many years urging claims hostile to the Constitution, in no very qualified terms. No, my lords, those for whom I would claim this boon, are the Protestants of Ireland, who,

A. All oppressors, by their own story, are an injured race. The West-Indian planters, if their own account of themselves be taken, are the most oppressed portion of the British subjects; and all the mischief arises from certain turbulent blacks, who will not lie still and be flogged.

Contrast this with the declaration *on the same side* by the member for Derry (p. 25 of this article), that 'the Protestants are in possession of all that is valuable in Ireland,'—'the establishments of the country conferring emolument and honour, are all Protestant,'—'the Church conferring a splendid provision upon its ministers, and the corpora-

I do not hesitate to affirm, are at this moment the most oppressed portion of the British subjects; in fact, they are a proscribed people; and if very strong measures are not adopted for their relief and security, all that are capable must leave the country, and we may expect to hear that the remainder have been annihilated in one way or another.—*Speech of Lord Lorton, February* 23, 1827.—p. 244.

tions giving station and power and influence to its members, are all Protestant, and have all, at no distant period, been in possession of Roman Catholics.' Contrast these, and say whether the allegation of suffering is anything, but the outcry of men fearing to lose what they know they unjustly possess.

'Can your lordship, 'laying your hand on 'your breast, appeal 'to your conscience 'and honour, and then 'say that the Irish 'Church establish- 'ment requires no re- 'form? It is impos- 'sible that you could, 'my lord, because it is 'monstrous to think 'of an annual income, 'amounting to several 'millions sterling, be- 'ing appropriated in 'such a country as 'Ireland, to the main- 'tenance of the pas- 'tors of less than one-thirtieth part of the population; laying aside 'all notice of the laws by which this revenue is protected and col- 'lected, their partial nature, the mode of administering them, and 'the character of the agents by whom they are executed.'—*Extract from the Letter of Dr. Doyle, as quoted in the Speech of Lord Lorton.* —*Id.* p. 251.

A. This is what the opponents of the Catholics are imprudent enough to allude to in their speeches. And here is the secret of what they call the oppression of the Protestants. They fear for the 'costly Meat Establishment.'—

'But, how is this?' I wondering cried,
As I walk'd that city fair and wide;
And saw in every marble street,
A row of beautiful butchers shops.
'What means, for men who don't eat meat,
This grand display of loins and chops?'
In vain I ask'd—'twas plain to see
That nobody dared to answer me.
MOORE'S *City of Hindostan.*

Those who support the bill ask, 'What danger can be apprehended from a few Roman Catholic members?' The number likely to be returned is described as exceedingly limited —*rari nantes in gurgite vasto.* But I will

A. Twenty-four members can only carry a great question, when half the rest of the House, minus twenty-three, are on the same side. There is a perilous struggle between justice and injustice *upon other points;* and the Tories cannot stand the chance of what might be effected by twenty-four.

remind the House, that twenty-four members may carry a great question.—*Speech of Sir C. Wetherell, March* 23, 1821.—p. 266.

Such is the opinion of every respectable writer on the subject —with one exception —I allude to Dr. Paley, who observes, that Roman Catholics and Protestants may meet in Parliament in as friendly a manner as if they assembled to discuss questions of history or philosophy. Now, I cannot conceive that Protestants and Roman Catholics could meet in Parliament in precisely the same way as if they assembled to form a *hortus siccus*, or to discuss some point relative to the natural history of birds, beasts, and fishes.—*Id.* 269.

A. The Protestants and Roman Catholics cannot meet in a friendly manner, to discuss the means by which one of them may be oppressed. But they may meet to arrange all the just and desirable operations of government; one of the first characteristics of which is, that *nobody* shall be oppressed.

Attempts, Sir, have already been made to invade the property of the Church, and particularly the possessions attached to it in Ireland. The honourable member for Montrose (Hume), whose activity would prevent him from letting slip any advantage that may offer for effecting that system of reduction of which he is the advocate, would find his efforts countenanced and fortified by Roman Catholic members, who could not be expected to have any other feelings than those of hostility against the Church Establishment. It is impossible to foresee what might be the success of a renewal of those attempts which have been hitherto defeated, when they should be backed by the influence to which I allude.—*Speech of the Right Honourable Henry Goulburn, April* 21, 1825.—p. 278.

A. The Roman Catholic members of the House of Commons would be very likely to join Mr. Hume in 'effecting that system of reduction of which he is the advocate.' Which is a good reason why all who rob the public should try to prevent their entrance; and why every other man in England should desire it.

It may be asked, why should difference of religious opinions produce political discord? It is sufficient to answer, that it always has produced that effect—that it produces it at the present moment—and

A. Under the influence of philosophy —or in other words, of the love of common sense, as it has been operating from the beginning of things to the present hour—man *has* ceased to be a religious animal, in the meaning in which the term is here employed. He has ceased to be an animal disposed to quarrel and fight for religion;—in the same

that until human nature is altered, and man, under the lights of the new philosophy, shall cease to be a religious animal, it will probably continue to produce the same effect, and to be made (as it has been termed) a stepping-stone to ambition, and to the acquisition of political power.—*Speech of Sir John Nicholl, Feb.* 3, 1812.—p. 289.

way that he has ceased to be disposed to quarrel and fight for property. He has found out that there is a better way for all parties,—*justice.*

Notwithstanding these misrepresentations, the great body [of the Irish] is attached to the empire, and not disposed to separate from Great Britain, or to unite themselves to France; they promptly and gallantly enter our fleets and armies; nay, it is frequently asserted in this House, that they fight the battles of the country, even beyond their proportionate numbers.—*Id.*

A. But they call for an army of thirty thousand men in Ireland; which Englishmen pay for. It is here that the six horses are dragging to the rear.

The love of power is universal. The Protestants equally possess it. They have the ascendancy—they have it justly; not only by the laws of the constitution, but as being four-fifths of the population of the empire.—*Id.* p. 294.

A. Four men have no right to rob *one* because they are four. It may be a just reason why they should have four-fifths of the common stock; but not why they should have it all.

The Protestants have a right to have a majority in parliament; but not to oust the minority from parliament. It must be an extraordinary head that does not perceive the difference.

Perseverance, however, is threatened. Can the Roman Catholics suppose that, upon a subject so vitally important to the best interests of the nation, the legislature will be teased into acquiescence by importunity? still less, that it will be overawed by menace? certainly not. It is only by a reference to the

A. All good things come by perseverance. The Catholics know that the *fluxion* of public opinion is in their favour. They know that the people of England are coming over to their side, and finding out that themselves and the Catholics are suffering from the same source—an overbearing oligarchy, determined to keep what they have, and to have what they can. And therefore they reasonably persevere.

All justice comes by fear. It comes by the apprehension of what may happen if it is refused. It comes, in short, by

reason and conviction of Parliament that they have any prospect of success to their application.—*Id.* p. 295.

prudence; and prudence is only fear looking through a high-power telescope. The friends of the Catholics wish to produce a conviction that it is *prudent*, to take off the six horses from the rear.

The principle of the measure concedes the right of admissibility to every office in the country, as belonging to every person of every sect. This is a principle somewhat similar to that which is held by individuals who contend for the radical doctrines of universal suffrage and annual parliaments — doctrines which I am convinced my right honourable friend holds in utter detestation. — *Speech of Mr. Bankes, March* 16, 1821.—p. 349.

A. If the principle of the measure is as demonstrably sound as the principle of universal suffrage and annual parliaments,—there may be no saying in what *Anno Domini* men will arrive at the comprehension of it, but there is no doubt of their coming to it in the end. In truth the principles are one and the same; being only part of the general demonstration, that when all have suffrage, then and not till then, property of all kinds has its due influence. This is the 'Newtonian Theory' of politics; the most important, and the last. The present system is a shuffle to keep undue power in the hands of the landowners, that they may make the others keep them. When the manufacturing and commercial interests find out, that universal suffrage would make every man keep himself,—then comes the tug of war.

The objections to annual parliaments, everybody knows, are like the reasoning of the boy that combed his hair once in seven years, and wondered how people bore it that combed it every day.

The enemies of justice have a great habit of supporting *infirmum per infirmius*. 'If you, Sir, believe *this* is an abuse and ought to be removed, you must believe *this other* is an abuse and ought to be removed,—which it is certain you must hold in utter detestation.'

What is a 'radical'? One that 'has the root of the matter in him.' One that knows his ills, and goes the way to remove them. The Whigs of 1688 were radicals; and so is every man that shuts his mouth to keep out flies.

In our days things are altered. The Whigs are nobody. They cry for the toy, and can do nothing with it when they get it. At all events they only stand for what they may count; and nobody expects of them any more. The theory of a go-

vernment like ours is, that the friends of abuses shall hold the reins, and be made to drive whither they would not;—that it shall be Prospero with Caliban for his coachman. And there is no leek they will not eat if they are obliged to it; the only question is how to collect a force of opinion, that shall make them apply themselves to their meal.

There was no more probability of a Whig ministry removing the Test Act, than of their removing Mont Blanc. The only chance they have for office again is, if the Tories should find the battle going too sore for them, and put in the Whigs for a wool-sack to turn shot. Half the Whigs are become Radicals; and the other half are following as fast as they can. So that unless the Tories make haste, there will be nobody to try the experiment on.

When parliament grants concessions, we are only building up steps by which the Roman Catholics will endeavour to reach at greater immunities. Can the right honourable gentleman imagine, that the exclusion from honours, distinctions, and offices, in which only a few of the Roman Catholic population can hope to participate, would have the effect of inflaming all Ireland, from one end to the other, and yet, that a system which touches their property—which affects that, the slightest interference with which every man is alive to—would create no irritation of feeling? Would they take no step to remove what they must necessarily look on as a material grievance? Would they not consider it a great injury to be subjected to the maintenance of a church which they hold in abhorrence? If they would not, they must be men of a different description from those born in any other country. Does the right honourable gentleman believe, that this settlement can be fixed permanently—that it can be made to last for ever?—*Id.* p. 351.

A. Will *things as they are* last, for ever? If the 'grievance' is such that nobody will tolerate it when mended, how small is the chance of its being tolerated now.

In the next place, can such a change be desired by the Protestants who Dissent from the Established Church, after that casual bond is dissolved which recently united them with the Roman Catholics, in pursuit of an object

A. The Dissenters have shown themselves honest men and wise,—quite fit to be trusted in the streets without either a keeper or a police-officer. Not an individual that was touched by the Test Act, has turned against the Catholics—or shown the common disposition of mankind, to kick down the ladder by which themselves have risen. The Dissenters know that the great security for the

which, so far as regards the Dissenters, no longer exists?—*Speeches upon the Roman Catholic Claims, by Charles Lord Colchester. June 10th,* 1828.—p. 99.

freedom of their respective sects, is in the freedom of everybody else. They have very little apprehension from the Catholics; but they are desperately afraid of Lord Colchester and his fellows.

Gentlemen! The alliance between Popery and Liberalism is no new event. Every one of the measures which cost King James the 2nd his Crown, were measures taken in the names of liberty of conscience, and the removal of political distinctions on account of religious differences; but, our ancestors knew that, while he talked of toleration, his ultimate aim was really persecution.—*Address to the Freeholders of the County of Kent, by Lord Bexley, October* 25, 1828.

A. James the 2nd was the fag end of an old party in the government, whose well-known object was, to establish a Catholic ascendancy, by fair means or by foul. There is no such danger now. And therefore, what was a clear fraud in one case, may be nothing like it in the other.

Hear what a Protestant Dissenter says to his brethren, and judge what probability there is of their dancing as Lord Colchester may pipe.

'But our rule of judgment is plain: persecution can never suppress error, nor advance truth. If a man's civil situation is made better by the belief of certain dogmas, or is made worse upon their denial,—you tempt him by a bribe, you intimidate him by a penalty. Both instances are of the very essence of persecution. Nothing is left to evidence: nothing rested on conviction. The Catholic is politically deprived on the *sole account* of speculative religious opinion. He is wrong: allow it: endeavour to undeceive his fallacies, to rectify his mistakes. By what weapons? by depressing his secular condition? by pointing at him as unworthy of confidence? Truth has no alliance with force, with proscription, with scorn. It only calls the power of reason and persuasion to its aid. This is the first principle of Protestant dissent. Not ignorant of such misery ourselves, we have learnt to rescue the miserable. Let the sentiments of men be most fanatical, they owe their account for them to God. If men do what is contrary to right, what is destructive to society, let the strong arm of the law punish them. But thoughts are not subjects, nor are theories crimes.'—*Letter on Catholic Emancipation, by the Rev. R. W. Hamilton of Leeds.* p. 4.

'Seek peace, shun faction, preserve charity: but remember that

every attempt to resist the liberty of others cannot be indifferent to you, must not find you neutral: *it is a threatening demonstration against your own.*'—p. 11.

This is one of the sufferers who have been dragged behind the carriage themselves, till like Sterne's negro girl, by feeling oppression they have learnt mercy. There is nothing to make men good Christians, like a community of suffering.

Among all the opponents of the Catholics, the feeblest are the interpreters of prophecy. All men find everybody they hate, in the book of the Revelation. The Westminster Review would be a vial or a trumpet, if it could only make itself of sufficient magnitude in the eyes of its enemies. The Protestant discovers the man of sin to be the pope. The Catholic with equal assurance believes him to be heresy. And Mr. Thomas Parkin*, with as good show of reason as the rest, declares him to be religious and civil despotism all over the earth. But waiving all question concerning the accuracy of their interpretation, how do the prophetic party in the House of Commons (for there is one) proceed to argue? They say they find it written, that the Catholics shall over-run the earth. And therefore they will vote against the Catholics' relief. Now if they know that it is to be, what use is there in the way they take to hinder it?—and how do they know that the way they take, *may not be the very way in which the thing is to be brought about?* Suppose it should turn out, that oppression ends in giving the Catholics an ascendancy, as it has already for one period given it to the Protestants. In such a consummation, how would the interpreters of prophecy excuse themselves, for having despised that greater prophet who said to them 'Do unto others as ye would they should do unto you?' Why are their own constructions of the visions of Patmos, to supersede the plain declaration of the Teacher of Nazareth? Let *us* do justly; and let prophecy take care of itself. If the Protestants are to go to the wall, to the wall they will go; but it is clear that it is not written, that they are to escape it by the commission of injustice.

The cause of the Catholics and religious liberty, on the whole, is going forward as its best friends would wish. The only chance of its opponents seems to be in provoking some Catholic to tread on a Protestant's toe, and so superseding the danger of discussion by the din of war. To this end they may

* An Exposure of Religious and Civil Despotism, in Observations on the Prophecies, &c., by Thomas Parkin.—Wightman and Cramp, 24, Paternoster Row. 1828.

be expected to bend all their skill; and the Catholics on their part will be as zealous to prevent them. When one side wants nothing but to see the knave of clubs, it is hard if the other does not contrive to keep it in his hand. All moderate men in England sigh to see the game brought to an end. All moderate men in Ireland, sigh ten times more. The ten horns, and the little horn—are nothing in comparison of peace, and a Christian-like act of parliament. There has been mischief enough with these 'horned nowt' already; men want now to make trial of mercy instead of sacrifice, and to give up the dark glass of prophecy, for what it has pleased God to make the broad day-light of justice and common sense*.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 January, 1829.

ART. XIII.—1. *Chansons Inédites de M. P. J. de Béranger.* Paris. Baudouin frères. 1828. 18o. pp. 132.

2. *Procès faits aux Chansons de P. J. de Béranger.* Paris. Baudouin frères. 1828. 32o. pp. 281.

IF Louis XIV had defeated the armies of William, and placed the miserable James upon the throne of England by foreign force, a parallel would have been presented to the operation, which, principally through the exertions of the English people under the guidance of their existing leaders, concluded the last European war. What was the morality, the wisdom, or the honour of the proceeding, must be left—as it *will* be left—to the decision of the times when nations shall have arrived at the same knowledge of their true interests, that individuals have attained on the subject of their own. A great country, after years or centuries of predisposing influences, had broken out into one of those paroxysms, which have at sundry times distressed, and will distress again, the supporters of dominant abuses in our own. An irresistible power called for the amelioration of the public tenement. The national lobster had grown too large for its shell, and burst with a convulsive crack the bonds that inclosed its nonage. The royal family chicaned—promised—kept their word as other kings have done—set off to join the foreign invader—were brought back—imprisoned—decapitated. Their conduct exhibited the same gross hypocrisy and incapacity for truth, which have at later periods been exemplified by the Desired, the Beloved, and the

* *Reprinted in various forms at the time of publication, and circulated to the number of between 30,000 and 40,000.*

Adored,—and which may be traced in all the proceedings of all the European sovereigns, except in those fortunate countries where the royal purity is strongly guarded by the hedge of popular control. They played the first scene in that tragi-comedy, which, with the exceptions mentioned, has made the word of a king in all tongues a paraphrase for falsehood. But they were opposed to a different kind of force from what was found in Naples or the Peninsula; and they consequently failed, where the others lived on and triumphed. The friends of existing evils in England took the alarm, on the same principle that makes a slave-master in Jamaica tremble at liberty in St. Domingo. The only refuge was in a war; and to this the people of England were but too much inclined, from the training which the unjust contest with their colonies had bestowed. The American struggle had made freedom anti-English, and England anti-*free*. The game of blood began; and was followed by all that was uncivilized in theory and barbarous in practice. The domains of ignorance and prejudice sent each its *élite;* or if any were absent, it was because the Chinese were inept for war, and the Man in the Moon was inaccessible. The felons of Poland came with unwashed hands, to make Paris another Warsaw; and England, that only held their garments in the former deed, was to be art and part in this. The young republic dashed the assailants back, as heaven has willed that the defenders of the right shall often, though not always, repulse their enemies. Barbarians of all feature, in turns retreated before a nation of honest men in arms; and the world began to think that Providence had resolved itself into a committee of public safety, and justice was henceforth to be the arbitress of victory.

Whether in every point the injured party acted in the best way possible, is what to this hour admits of some dispute; but that the whole war against renovated France was a struggle for the preservation of profitable wrongs at home, is what none in the present age affect to doubt, who are not actively engaged in supporting the same interest still. The condemnation of the king was one of those subjects, on which many opinions will always be held by many men. It was supported by the direct example of England. Her existing institutions, avowedly superior to those of France, were all founded on the issue of a contest, of which a scene of this kind had wound up the first act; and if the precedent had not been confirmed within the memory of living men, it was only because the last Charles refused to wait for the experiment. Three leaves of the Book of Common Prayer wailed over the tyrant's fate; but profaner

classics declared it to be a 'glorious act of substantial justice,' and the nation acquiesced in silence in the creed. The reasons deducible from the ordinary rules of retributive infliction were also of imposing magnitude. If there was any just power of punishing an individual for offences against the community, it was surely applicable to that individual who had the greatest reason to be contented with his lot. Either men must set-to their hands to being the born thralls of a proprietor of human cattle; or they must maintain that while there were obligations and penalties on one side, there must also be some upon the other. If a private soldier could be shot for deserting to the enemy after the engagement of an oath, a king could be beheaded when taken in the same fact. If this was not written right, it was acknowledged right; for England—the *magna virûm mater*—had dashed the responsibility of kings into the common law of nations, and left it sticking there for ever. Such were the arguments of those who tried their king as a deserter, because he *was* a deserter,—and crushed the porcelain clay of human kind, in the same mill that grinds plebeian dust when it falls into foul offence against the clods that are its fellows. Their opponents answered them partly by appeals to the divine right of wrong, and partly by the assertion of the *impolicy* of the proceeding. It was to harden the hearts of kings, and the streams of human felicity were to be shut up in their source. It was a horror and a solecism; equalled only when the first noble was executed for the murder of his vassal. Good blood throughout Europe was to run *a-muck* against the offenders, and the plebeian puddle was to find out its mistake in the dust where it was bred. Plebeian generals and citizen *pièces de quatre* refuted this reasoning; but still the great argument upon the question remained untouched. When a live god in Thibet has been fattened in a coop from his youth up, it would be unreasonable to expect from him either mental or corporeal energy; it would be hard to demand of him much moral virtue; and it would be downright cruelty to put him to death for his deficiency in either. It is the previous estate and training of despotic monarchs, that removes them from fair liability to capital punishment; on the same principles that are acknowledged in the case of those who are physically deficient. Let any reasonable man inquire of himself, by what processes he has arrived at any knowledge, or at any virtue,—how much of his morality he owes to the hourly apprehension of consequences,—how much of his prudence to collision with men of like powers with himself,—and how much of his reverence for truth to the dread of the contempt of his equals,—and then let

him determine, what portion of all these would have appertained to him, if he had been surrounded from his infancy by insinuations that his will made law, his opinions wisdom, and his word facts. The fault is in the institution of live gods: the vice is in the system, which in attempting to raise one unfortunate individual above the level of humanity, sinks him beneath it. If men will have such idols, they ought to take the consequences along with them; but not make a holocaust of a poor puppet who after all has flesh and blood, for being what in a common man would be a liar, a cut-throat, or a knave.

A new phasis developed itself in the contest. The Newton of war appeared; and overturned the established theories, by placing in the centre what had always been looked for in the circumference. The invaded became the invaders, by the same right that the baffled highwayman is followed into his lair. Glory and success nailed themselves to the republican standards; and for once arms were pious, and invasion virtue. It was the golden age of war; the sunny spot in the annals of the destroying art, on which a philanthropic soldier may look with complacency and joy. Such victories could not last. Even the corruptionists of England, who neither paid nor fought but with the purses and blood of others, retired from the field; and the populace of London, honest though in bondage, decreed an ovation to the representative of national independence in the person of an enemy.

But another phasis was at hand. The unequalled warrior who had guided the steam-vessel of the republic with such glory on its course, *found out that his first duty was to extinguish the volcano that was within.* The contest was renewed, upon that ground which is always in the power of the basest and the worst,—the refusal to fulfil the stipulations of the preceding treaty. Long the proud vessel kept her way; but each effort expended something of the powers of the enfeebled fires that impelled. A weary war in Spain—as unjust as those which England wages annually in the East—exhausted the blood of the community, for no object that came home to the hearth of the peasant and the bosom of the citizen. The conscript, that used to be a hero, sank into a victim. A new war arose, not unjust in itself, for, like that with England, it sprang out of the refusal to fulfil the stipulations of a treaty. The leader whom fortune had so often favoured, continued, like a mad gamester, to risk his winnings for the chance of doubling their amount. The blow came at last, as come it must; and the proudest army the world ever saw,—the relics of a thousand victories, won for civilized man from the barbarian and the

slave,—fell, not by its enemies, but by the elements; as if nature alone was worthy to be its conqueror. Still the great nation rallied; and the grandeur of its sacrifices composed its title to the name. Once and oftener, the tide was rolled back; but numbers began to assert their power, and fortune to show her attachment to the new. A military defection, unparalleled in the history of armies, lost a great battle; and step by step the lion retired to his hold, followed by 'the sons of little men,' who sprouted into demigods on the strength of their respective fractions in the fray. Even yet, if vain man could have been wise, the mischief might have been repaired. One signal of returning to the rock whence he was hewn, would have put all France into the *pas de charge*, and left his enemies no results but the infamy of the breaches of military faith which marked their hour of success,—breaches which still rankle in the heart of the professional soldier all over the earth, and prove that in the field as in the cabinet, an incapacity for truth is the infirmity of kings. But the signal never came; and the fate of civilized Europe was left to a diminished army, and unequal war. The same infatuation which prevented an earlier appeal to the principles of popular resistance, put the capital into the possession of the enemy. The treachery of chiefs,—for the poor soldier always dies honest,—removed the latest hope. And then appeared the last symbol of a nation's fall; an over-fed old man, the representative of a race whom every village in France had declared to be Pretenders by the blood of twenty of its children, hobbled in to the music of foreign drums, and sat down with the gracious airs of the husband in the comedy, *trop heureux d'être pris par ordre du médecin.* The game of war was closed. It was held to be established for ever, that legitimacy meant foreign choice; and the magnanimous electors withdrew to enjoy the gaze of the nation that had paid for their supremacy. The joy of the English people was in proportion to their fears. Men lost their wits, and women their modesty; and scanty was the remnant that in those days of shame refused to bow to the Baals of the hour. But the end was not yet. In a little year was announced *the people's* king, and flew back to his throne without a sword being drawn for the foreign appointee. The *génie saint des camps étrangers* was again invoked. All Europe was in arms. The English minister boasted that a million and a half of soldiers were in motion, to replace the French Stuart and declare by proxy his own sovereign a usurper. The English oligarchy fought *pro aris et focis;* for there wanted but a failure, to crumble their power to the dust. The friends of liberty and national rights

were but half alert upon their post. They declared the *danger* of the contest, but shrank from the unpopularity of denouncing its injustice; and the desperation of their repentance served only to illustrate the magnitude of their mistake. Mean time the decision by arms drew on. The legitimate sovereign—for it would be treason to the house of Brunswick to affect to doubt his title—moved rapidly upon the nearest of his enemies, at the head of all in France that was accessible to the feeling of national honour or disgrace. His army fought, as soldiers always fight, who join an intense feeling of the justice of their cause, to attachment to their chief. The odds of combat might have been said to be balanced,—if it could have been forgotten that one army was but of a hundred days, and had been exposed to all the disorganization which the genius of adversaries could invent. To make the party equal, it should be supposed that officers on both sides had been going over to the enemy, and leaving their names as synonymes for desertion under fire. Of two grand detachments from the opposing forces, one rejoined its main body in the moment of closest struggle, and the other did not. What would have come to pass if this had not happened,—or if the converse had happened,—is what the constitution of nature has forbidden to explore. As it was, there was no military inference derivable from the result, except that the defensive power of the infantry weapon had been generally rated too low. The event, however, determined that Ferdinand should reign in Spain, and Miguel in Portugal; and *Louis deux fois neuf* returned to complete the espousals so auspiciously begun. What else there was, it is useless for an Englishman to remember, as for an Algerine to dwell on the misfortune of his birth-place. What is known, needs not be again recorded; and what is recorded as it is, can never cease to be known too well.

But the optimism that is in the world prevailed. The polype of human happiness, though cut in pieces and turned inside out, still lives, and applies itself to multiply and grow. Men cannot despond for ever; the machinery of hope goes on, though Pompey lost Pharsalia, and perished basely on a foreign strand. Of two courses an intrusive government must always take one. It must encounter the certainty of being turned out on the first opportunity; or it must come down to the national demand, and submit, with what grace it may, to be the dispenser of the public will. The probability of the latter consummation must be in proportion to its weakness; and its weakness, as in other cases, will be indicated by its fears. A ballad-maker prosecuted,—is a clear proof that France

will be a republic with the Bourbons in the Tuileries. Stocks ought to rise upon it; and the Stock Exchange has a right to know the whole of circumstances so important to its interests. An epic poem, might have made three-per-cents look up at the close of a dull day,—a tragedy, might have raised them a shade since three o'clock,—but a ballad, a book of ballads, is an *évènement majeur*,—it is of the *intérêts sensibles et puissans*. Was it a good ballad, or a bad ballad? Was it to the tune of *Te souviens-tu?* or *Mon père m'a donné un mari, mon Dieu, quel homme!* Had it a burden like *Lilli burlero*, or had it none? Was it in 'all eights,' or in 'particular measure'? These are points which it concerns the English people to know; and it is fortunate when a Review can make itself of such substantial use, as by explaining them.

The first of the redoubtable ballads which shook the frame of monarchy in France, is "*Le Sacre de Charles le Simple*;" whose story appears to be, that

* 'Charles III, dit le Simple, l'un des successeurs de Charlemagne, fut d'abord évincé du trône par Eudes, comte de Paris. Il se réfugia en Angleterre, puis en Allemagne. Mais, à la mort d'Eudes (en 898), les seigneurs et les évêques français s'étant rattachés à Charles, lui rendirent la couronne, qu'il perdit enfin, lorsque trahi par Hébert, comte de Vermandois, il fut emprisonné à Péronne, où il mourut en 924.'

On which piece of history the dangerous ballad-maker sings as follows:—

AIR: Du beau Tristan (de Beauplan).

† Français, que Rheims a réunis,
Criez; Montjoie et Saint-Denis!
On a refait la sainte ampoule,
Et, comme au temps de nos aïeux,
Des passereaux lâchés en foule

CORONATION OF CHARLES THE SIMPLE.

* 'Charles III, surnamed the Simple, one of the successors of Charlemagne, was first driven from the throne by Eudes, count of Paris. He took refuge in England, and afterwards in Germany. But on the death of Eudes (in 898) the French lords and bishops attached themselves to Charles again, and restored him the crown; which he finally lost, when on being betrayed by Hebert, count of Vermandois, he was put in prison at Peronne, where he died in 924.'

(*Translation by a friend.*)

† Frenchmen! in Rheims assemble all,
On Montjoy and St. Dennis call—
Repair'd the holy phial see—
Our fathers' days again are come;
Sparrows in numerous flocks set free

Dans l'église volent joyeux.
D'un joug brisé ces vains présages
Font sourire sa majesté.
Le peuple s'écrie: Oiseaux, plus que nous soyez sages,
Gardez bien, gardez bien votre liberté (*bis*).

Puisqu'aux vieux *us* on rend leurs droits,
Moi, je remonte à Charles trois.
Ce successeur de Charlemagne
De Simple mérita le nom.
Il avait couru l'Allemagne,
Sans illustrer son vieux pennon,
Pourtant, à son sacre on se presse;
Oiseaux et flatteurs ont chanté.
Le peuple s'écrie: Oiseaux, point de folle allégresse!
Gardez bien, gardez bien votre liberté (*bis*).

Chamarré de vieux oripeaux,
Ce roi, grand avaleur d'impôts,
Marche entouré de ses fidèles,
Qui tous, en des temps moins heureux,
Ont suivi les drapeaux rebelles
D'un usurpateur généreux.
Un milliard les met en haleine;
C'est peu pour la fidélité.
Le peuple s'écrie: Oiseaux, nous payons notre chaîne.
Gardez bien, gardez bien votre liberté (*bis*).

Flutter about the sacred dome;
The monarch's brow with pleasure beams,
For broken bonds here imaged be—
The people cry: Poor birds! dream not our foolish dreams—
Preserve—preserve your liberty.

Here are all ancient rights preferr'd,
So I go back to Charles the Third—
Who follow'd Charlemagne, and well
Deserv'd "the Simple" name he bore—
Upon his flag no light-stream fell,
When Germany he travell'd o'er.—
When he was crown'd, a noisy crowd
Of birds and flatterers sang with glee.—
The people cry—Ye birds! O sing not now so loud—
Preserve—preserve your liberty.

Bedizen'd with their fripperies, made
From heavy imposts—the parade
Of King and Courtiers marches by—
Courtiers—who all, not long ago,
'Neath rebel standards floating high,
Bow'd to a grand usurper, low;
But millions are not shower'd in vain—
And faith well recompens'd should be;
The people cry—Poor birds! we dearly pay our chain,
Preserve—preserve your liberty.

Aux pieds de prélats cousus d'or
Charles dit son *confiteor*.
On l'habille, on le baise, on l'huile,
Puis, au bruit des hymnes sacrés,
Il met la main sur l'Evangile.
Son confesseur lui dit : " Jurez :
" Rome, que l'article concerne,
" Relève d'un serment prêté."
Le peuple s'écrie : Oiseaux, voilà comme on gouverne !
Gardez bien, gardez bien votre liberté (*bis*).

De Charlemagne, en vrai luron,
Dès qu'il a mis le ceinturon,
Charles s'étend sur la poussière.
Roi ! crie un soldat, levez-vous !
" Non, dit l'évêque ; et, par Saint-Pierre,
" Je te couronne ; enrichis-nous.
" Ce qui vient de Dieu vient des prêtres,
" Vive la légitimité !"
Le peuple s'écrie : Oiseaux, notre maître a des maîtres.
Gardez bien, gardez bien votre liberté (*bis*).

Oiseaux, ce roi miraculeux
Va guérir tous les scrofuleux.

Now, gold-laced prelates bent before,
Charles utters his *confiteor*,
They clothe him—kiss him—oil him—and
Midst hymns divine that fill the air,
He on the bible puts his hand !
And his confessor bids him—" Swear !
For Rome—whom such affairs concern—
Has pardons for such perjury."
The people cry—Poor birds ! thus government we learn—
Preserve—preserve your liberty.

So—aping Charlemagne—when placed
The sword-belt round his royal waist,
Upon the dust he flings him down,
King ! says a soldier—rouse thee, King !
" No !" says the bishop—" thee I crown—
Now wealth into our coffers fling.
What priests command, that God records;
Long live, long live legit'macy !"
The people cry—Our lord is ruled by other lords—
Poor birds ! preserve your liberty.

This King miraculous, poor birds !
Will cure all scrofulas with words ;

Fuyez, vous qui de son cortège
Dissipez seul l'ennui mortel ;
Vous pourriez faire un sacrilège
En voltigeant sur cet autel.
Des bourreaux sont les sentinelles
Que pose ici la piété.
Le peuple s'écrie : Oiseaux, nous envions vos ailes.
Gardez bien, gardez bien votre liberté (*bis*),
Gardez bien votre liberté. —p. 45.

Turlupin—who is Merry Andrew—is understood to have given great offence :—

* —Du roi viens voir la personne.
—Non, répondait-il, non pas.
Otera-t-il sa couronne,
Quand je mettrai chapeau bas ?
Ma foi, s'il faut crier vive,
Ah !
Vive l'ami qui cuit mon pain !
Que l'on suive, suive, suive
L'exemple de Turlupin. —p. 63.

But the sin of sins is the ballad called "*Les Infiniment Petits, ou La Gérontocratie.*"

AIR : Ainsi jadis un grand prophète.

† J'ai foi dans la sorcellerie.
Or un grand sorcier l'autre soir
Me fit voir de notre patrie
Tout l'avenir dans un miroir,

But you, the merriest things of all,
Had better speedily be gone ;
Some sacrilege you might let fall
In fluttering near this altar-throne ;
For piety all-meekly brings
Murderers her sentinels to be.—
The people cry—Poor birds ! we envy you your wings—
Preserve—preserve your liberty.

TURLUPIN.

* Come let us go "le Roi" to see—
Not I—he said—I won't do that ;
Will he take off his crown to me,
When I to him take off my hat ?
If I for somebody must cry,
Then, Here's for him that makes my bread !
And men will answer—I—I—I—
Say just what Merryman has said !

THE INFINITELY LITTLE; OR THE GREYBEARD DYNASTY.

† I don't think witchcraft quite so bad,
For t'other day a witch drew nigh,
And I a blessed vision had
Of time's unveil'd futurity :

Quelle image désespérante !
Je vois Paris et ses faubourgs ;
Nous sommes en dix-neuf cent trente
Et les barbons règnent toujours.

Un peuple de nains nous remplace.
Nos petits-fils sont si petits,
Qu'avec peine dans cette glace,
Sous leurs toits je les vois blottis.
La France est l'ombre du fantôme
De la France de mes beaux jours.
Ce n'est qu'un tout petit royaume ;
Mais les barbons règnent toujours.

Combien d'imperceptibles êtres !
De petits jésuites bilieux !
De milliers d'aufres petits prêtres
Qui portent de petits bons dieux !
Béni par eux, tout dégénère ;
Par eux la plus vieille des cours
N'est plus qu'un petit séminaire ;
Mais les barbons règnent toujours.

Tout est petit, palais, usines,
Sciences, commerce, beaux-arts.

O melancholy sight to see !
Does Paris yet its name retain ?
'Tis nineteen-hundred thirty-three,
And still the greybeard Bourbons* reign.

Our children are a dwarfish race,
Our little ones so little are,
Beneath their roof I scarce can trace
Their little selves—they seem so far.
And France the shadowy phantom is
Of France before her mournful wane ;—
A very little kingdom this—
But still the greybeard Bourbons reign.

What little things, scarce visible !
What little Jesuits, full of bile !
Millions of little priests who tell
Their little rosaries the while !
Beneath their blessing all decays;
A little college for their train,
Usurps the court of ancient days—
But still the greybeard Bourbons reign.

'Tis petty all—in palace—shop—
Art—science—commerce—petty, all :

* *There is a kind of pun intended in the original, between the sound of "barbons" (greybeards), and "Bourbons;" which it is impossible to give in a translation.*

De bonnes petites famines
Désolent de petits remparts.
Sur la frontière mal fermée,
Marche, au bruit de petits tambours,
Une pauvre petite armée ;
Mais les barbons règnent toujours.

Enfin le miroir prophétique,
Complétant ce triste avenir,
Me montre un géant hérétique,
Qu'un monde a peine à contenir.
Du peuple pygmée il s'approche,
Et, bravant de petits discours,
Met le royaume dans sa poche ;
Mais les barbons règnent toujours. —p. 77.

Another piece which gave mortal offence, was "*La Mort du Diable ;*" in which the Jesuits, under the title of their founder Ignatius Loyola, are represented as succeeding to the power of the prince of this world; on the demise of the last-mentioned potentate. The friends of the parties of course cry treason and blasphemy; but those who hold no particular relationship with either, see in it nothing but a proof of the small chance an encroaching priesthood has of carrying its point, against the feeling of even a Catholic community.

AIR : Du Vilain, *ou* de Ninon chez madame de Sévigné.

* Du miracle que je retrace
Dans ce récit des plus succincts,
Rendez gloire au grand saint Ignace,
Patron de tous nos petits saints.

And pretty little famines stop
Supplies to little towns—which fall—
And led by little drums—a host
Of little soldiers seek in vain
To guard the feeble frontier coast ;—
But still the greybeard Bourbons reign.

In the prophetic mirror drawn,
At last a fearful tale was told—
A giant heretic was shown,
Whom all the world could scarcely hold—
He o'er the pigmy people striding,
Despis'd their petty clamorous strain,
The kingdom in his pocket hiding—
But still the greybeard Bourbons reign.

THE DEVIL'S DEATH.

* I sing to day a lay of lays,
A glorious miracle you'll see ;
Give the great Saint Ignatius praise,
Of all small saints the patron he.

Par un tour, qui serait infâme,
Si les saints pouvaient avoir tort,
Au diable il a fait rendre l'âme. (*bis*).
Le diable est mort, le diable est mort. (*ter*).

Satan, l'ayant surpris à table,
Lui dit: Trinquons, ou sois honni.
L'autre accepte, mais verse au diable
Dans son vin un poison béni.
Satan boit, et, pris de colique,
Il jure, il grimace, il se tord;
Il crève comme un hérétique.
Le diable est mort, le diable est mort. (*ter*).

Il est mort! disent tous les moines,
On n'achètera plus d'*agnus*."
Il est mort! disent les chanoines;
On ne paiera plus d'*oremus*.
Au conclave on se désespère,
Adieu, puissance et coffre-fort!
Nous avons perdu notre père.
Le diable est mort, le diable est mort. (*ter*).

L'amour sert bien moins que la crainte;
Elle nous comblait de ses dons.

A dirty trick—if saints can trick,
And if the truth may all be said,
Has done the bus'ness for Old Nick;
The Devil's dead—the Devil's dead!

Old Nick went out one day to dine,
And pledg'd the saint to drink his health.
Aye! said the saint—and in the wine
Some holy poison dropp'd by stealth;
Gripes seiz'd the Devil—cruel-sick—
He swears—he storms—and hangs his head,
Then bursts like roasted heretic—
The Devil's dead—the Devil's dead!

Alas! he's dead—the friars said,—
The devil an *Agnus* shall we sell;
Alas! the canons cried—he's dead—
Not one *Oremus* shall we tell.
The conclave is in deep despair,—
Power, and the iron chest, are fled—
O we have lost our father dear,
The Devil's dead—the Devil's dead!

Love is not half so strong as fear,
For fear was constant with its gifts;

L'intolérance est presque éteinte ;
Qui rallumera ses brandons ?
A notre joug si l'homme échappe,
La vérité luira d'abord :
Dieu sera plus grand que le pape.
Le diable est mort, le diable est mort. (*ter*).

Ignace accourt ; Que l'on me donne,
Leur dit-il, sa place et ses droits.
Il n'épouvantait plus personne ;
Je ferai trembler jusqu'aux rois.
Vols, massacres, guerres ou pestes,
M'enrichiront du sud au nord.
Dieu ne vivra que de mes restes.
Le diable est mort, le diable est mort. (*ter*).

Tous de s'écrier : Ah ! brave homme !
Nous te bénissons dans ton fiel.
Soudain son ordre, appui de Rome,
Voit sa robe effrayer le ciel.
Un chœur d'anges, l'âme contrite,
Dit : des humains plaignons le sort :
De l'enfer saint Ignace hérite.
Le diable est mort, le diable est mort. (*ter*).

For these poetical licences, the author was punished with a fine of 10,000 francs (400*l.*) and nine months imprisonment. The ballads are the numerator, the punishment the denomi-

---

Intolerance is fading here,—
Who now her blazing torch uplifts ?
If man from us should once be free,
What light may beam upon his head !
God greater than the Pope shall be—
The Devil's dead—the Devil's dead !

Ignatius came—" Let me but take
" His place—his right—and see ; in brief—
" He has made men for ages quake,
" I'll make Kings tremble like a leaf.
" With plagues, thefts, massacres, I'll ban
" Both north and south ;—where'er I tread,
" Leave ruins both for God and man—
" The Devil's dead—the Devil's dead ! "

" Come, blessed one," they uttered, " come,"
" We hallow thy most saintly gall "—
And now his Order—sent from Rome,
O'ershadows, darkens, curses all,
I heard a choir of Angels tell
Their sympathies for man ;—they said,
" Ignatius is the heir of hell,
" The Devil's dead—the Devil's dead ! "

nator, and the '*petit, petit*' quotient is the chance the Bourbons have of resisting the will of France.

Le Convoi de David—not the husband of Uriah's wife, but David the painter,—the *Couplets sur la Journée de Waterloo*—*Les deux Grenadiers*—*Le Prisonnier de Guerre*—*Les Souvenirs du Peuple*—and *Le Tombeau de Manuel*, are full of popular images, presenting a lively representation of what would have been the condition of England if Louis had conquered William; and are executed with sufficient power to make it credible that such compositions would not have been acceptable to the restored tenants of St. James's. *La Comète de* 1832, is Horace with a mixture of Lord Byron; and this article cannot be concluded better than by giving it entire.

AIR: A soixante ans il ne faut pas remettre.

* Dieu contre nous envoie une comète;
A ce grand choc nous n'échapperons pas.
Je sens déjà crouler notre planète;
L'Observatoire y perdra ses compas. (*bis*).
Avec la table, adieu tous les convives!
Pour peu de gens le banquet fut joyeux. (*bis*).
Vite, à confesse, allez, âmes craintives.
Finissons-en: le monde est assez vieux,
Le monde est assez vieux. (*bis*).

Oui, pauvre globe, égaré dans l'espace,
Embrouille enfin tes nuits avec tes jours;
Et, cerf-volant dont la ficelle casse,
Tourne en tombant, tourne et tombe toujours.
Va, franchissant des routes qu'on ignore,
Contre un soleil te briser dans les cieux.
Tu l'éteindrais; que de soleils encore!
Finissons-en: le monde est assez vieux.

THE COMET OF 1832.

* A comet wing'd by heaven is hurl'd to meet
Our world—too surely 'twill destruction bring—
I feel our planet tremble at my feet,
I see the lofty light-house tottering;
The table disappears—the guests are gone—
'Twas a sad festival when all is told;
On—to confession—trembling spirits—on—
Enough—enough—the world is all too old.

Poor globe—thro' boundless space a wandering thing,—
Nights, days, confounded,—erring without will;
A flying kite—but with a broken string,—
Turning and sinking—turning, sinking still;
Rush through untravell'd ways—until thou dash
Against some sun, and breaking, do behold
A thousand suns out-bursting from the flash—
Enough—enough—the world is all too old.

N'est-on pas las d'ambitions vulgaires ?
De sots parés de pompeux sobriquets ?
D'abus, d'erreurs, de rapines, de guerres ?
De laquais rois, de peuples de laquais ?
N'est-on pas las de tous nos dieux de plâtre ?
Vers l'avenir las de tourner les yeux ?
Ah ! c'en est trop pour si petit théâtre :
Finissons-en : le monde est assez vieux.

Les jeunes gens me disent : " Tout chemine.
" A petit bruit chacun lime ses fers.
" La presse éclaire, et le gaz illumine ;
" Et la vapeur vole aplanir les mers.
" Vingt ans au plus, bon homme, attends encore.
" L'œuf éclôra sous un rayon des cieux."
Trente ans s,amis, j'ai cru le voir éclore.
Finissons-en : le monde est assez vieux.

Bien autrement je parlais, quand la vie
Gonflait mon cœur et de joie et d'amour.
Terre, disais-je, ah ! jamais ne dévie
Du cercle heureux où Dieu sema le jour.
Mais je vieillis, la beauté me rejette ;
Ma voix s'éteint ; plus de concerts joyeux.
Arrive donc, implacable comète
Finissons-en : le monde est assez vieux.

Vulgar and stale, our poor ambitions are!
Are we not tir'd of fools and foolish things,
Errors, abuses, desolation, war,
Of nations lacqueys, and of lacquey kings?
Tir'd of the future's disappointing dreams—
Of plaster-idols shap'd in meanest mould—
How low—how cramp'd life's scene of being seems ;
Enough—enough—the world is all too old.

I hear youth say—" Man's prospect daily brightens,
" Each files his fetters surely—silently ;—
" The press illumines, and the gas enlightens;
" The glorious steam-boat speeds across the sea,
" Another twenty years—and then—and then !—
"A sun-beam shall the lovely germ unfold."
Oh! I have waited thirty years in vain—
Enough—enough—the world is all too old.

Far other were my thoughts, when boyhood gay
Swell'd all my soul with love, and joy, and mirth ;
Then cried I—" Never wander from the way
Of thy sweet orbit—beauty-giving earth!"
Now I am grey with years—and beauty's frown—
My songs are mute—my heart is dull and cold;
Comet implacable—then speed thee down,
Let's end the matter—for the world is old.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 January, 1829.

ART. XV.—1. *Quarterly Review, No. LXVI; Article on Irish Absentees.*

2. *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine for December,* 1828; p. 702.

WHEN the removal of a great evil is in agitation, and the hopes of honest men begin to rise, and those of their opponents proportionally to quail, then is the precise time to throw in a mystification of the cause,—to turn adrift some lantern in a tub, as crafty skippers wont when sorely pressed by cruisers on the deep. Just such an opportunity is held forth at the present conjuncture, on the question of Ireland's ills; and it seems next to impossible, that during the approaching session, some spruce commoner or puffy peer should not essay to rig out the shell of Absenteeism for service in his cause. The government that recalled Lord Anglesey would probably give such a speculation fair play, and gladly defer the experiment of emancipation till a few years trial had been given to its rival. Whether the Catholics would chase the false light, is chiefly their own concern; but there is enough in the quarter from which it is already shown, to warn them at least to look before they follow.

The history of the question of Absenteeism is curious. A political economist, in evidence before a committee of the House of Commons, declared that absenteeism was *not* the cause of the misery of Ireland; and gave his reasons. The Quarterly Review detected an error in the reasoning; and so, with briefer

> 'wandering fires that move
> In sweet accord of harmony and love,'

sang victory. But the spirit of evil is not tamed with harp-strings; and lo! the fiend is up again and doing, till Vishnu array himself in trimestral or monthly incarnation, to return him to his deep.

The questions put by the Select Committee of the House of Commons, and the evidence, were as follow:—

'Supposing the absentee landlords of Ireland were to return and reside upon their estates, is it your opinion that that would be productive of any decided advantage to the lower orders of the people?—No. I am not aware that it would be productive of any advantage to them in the way of increasing the general and average rate of wages all over the country.

'Would not the expenditure of their incomes among them be pro-

ductive of great good?—The income of a landlord, when he is an absentee, is really as much expended in Ireland as if he were living in it.

'Will you have the goodness to explain that a little further?—When a landlord becomes an absentee, his rent must be remitted to him one way or another; it must be remitted to him either in money or in commodities. I suppose it will be conceded that it cannot continue to be remitted to him from Ireland in money, there being no money to make the remittance; for, if the rents of two or three estates were remitted in money, it would make a scarcity of money and raise its value, so that its remittance would inevitably cease; it is clear, then, that the rents of absentees can only be remitted in commodities And this, I think, would be the nature of the operation:—when a landlord has an estate in Ireland, and goes to live in London or Paris, his agent gets his rent, and goes and buys a bill of exchange with it; now this bill of exchange is a draught drawn against equivalent commodities that are to be exported from Ireland; it is nothing more than an order to receive an equivalent in commodities which must be sent from Ireland. The merchants who get 10,000*l.*, or any other sum from the agent of an absentee landlord, go into the Irish market and buy exactly the same amount of commodities as the landlord would have bought had he been at home; the only difference being, that the landlord would eat and wear them in London or Paris, and not in Dublin, or in his house in Ireland.

'Therefore, in proportion to the amount of rent remitted, will be the correspondent export of Irish commodities?—Precisely: if the remittances to absentee landlords amount to three millions a-year, were the absentee landlords to return home to Ireland the foreign trade of Ireland would be diminished to that amount.'—*Report from the Select Committee on the State of Ireland;* 1825. *Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed,* 30*th June,* 1825—*p.* 813. *Evidence of J. R. M'Culloch, esq. June* 30*th,* 1825.

On this, it was said by the Quarterly Reviewers—

'Let it be assumed, then, that the rent due to an absentee amounts to a hundred quarters of wheat, a hundred heads of cattle, and a hundred firkins of butter; and that his tenants convey these commodities to Cork, whence they are transported to England, France, or Italy, for the use of the landlord. If the owner of this estate lived in Ireland, he would expend his wheat, beef, and butter, on Irish footmen and housemaids; on Irish tailors, coachmakers, butchers, bakers, &c., to whom he would give employment; but, as an absentee, he expends them on the domestics, artisans, and mechanics, whom he employs at Westminster, Paris, or Naples. Still, if we are to believe the "witness," "his income is as much expended in Ireland as if he were living in it."

'The extravagant and truly ridiculous blunder into which the "witness" has fallen arose, we presume, from his overlooking a most material feature which distinguishes the export trade of Ireland from

that of every other country. When other countries export commodities of which they have a surplus, they import articles of equal intrinsic value. The advantages of this traffic are therefore mutual. But for the vast quantities of raw produce—for the wheat, beef, and butter, worth, we should suppose, at the least, four millions per annum, which are now sent out of Ireland to pay absentee landlords, that country receives no return, except receipts for rent can be represented in that light. Hence it must be evident that to the parties concerned in this trade, there can be no reciprocity of advantages. The hungry population of Ireland are doomed to stand idly by and see a vast proportion (probably not less than one half) of the whole produce of the country exported from its different harbours to be expended by absentee landlords on foreign domestics and artisans. The meal is taken away, while the mouths into which it ought to go are left behind.—*Quarterly Review—No.* 66. *Art. on Irish Absentees.* p. 460.

This may not be very clearly stated; but it points to an objection which has never been answered, and is probably unanswerable. There has been a simple omission of one of the articles in the account; namely, that when the money is paid to Irish footmen and housemaids, tailors, coachmakers, &c.—in short, to that train of dependents which Miss Edgeworth has somewhere called *a tail,*—it is by them expended on beef, butter, or some kind of Irish produce, just as much as when it is paid to a merchant in Cork for the purpose of effecting a remittance to an absentee. The difference in the two cases, therefore, as far as can be gathered from the argument before the House, is that in one *the tail* is starved.

After this admission, it may appear strange that there should be any further question. But because a thing has not been proved, it does not follow that it cannot be proved. It does not even follow that an inference, which may be correct enough upon the principles assumed, shall be the true one; for there may be some deeper principle which has been overlooked, and which shall swallow up both principles and inference. An instance in point is the Theory of Tides. The superficial inference would clearly be, that there should be high water once a day, and spring-tides once a month. But deeper principles lead to the demonstration that they should be twice; and nature confirms the truth.

The real answer to the assertion that absenteeism is the cause of the misery of Ireland, is,

First, That at all events what can at the present moment be engaged in hurting Ireland, is not the mass of existing absenteeism, but only the quantity by which it happens to be increasing. So that there is an attempt to substitute the prin-

cipal for the interest, or as a mathematician would say, the integral for the increment.

Secondly, That the idea that Ireland would be relieved by any circumstance that should put an end to this increment,—(short of persuading men to like whiskey as well as claret, or something analogous to it,) is a fallacy of the same nature as Colbert's proposal to make France full of bread, by prohibiting the exportation of corn.

Keeping the second principle for the present out of sight, it is at all events plain that the only permanent effect of any given quantity of absenteeism, is *to make Ireland a smaller Ireland.* If Irishmen are miserable, there are fewer of them to be miserable; and if happy, there are fewer to be happy; but neither their individual happiness nor misery is affected by it, except at the period when the change is taking place. If all the absentees were to come back in a flock, it would undoubtedly cause a spirt of employment and felicity in Ireland. But as soon as this spirt was over, the effect would be the same as if a new county Kerry had risen out of the sea;—not a new county for the old county to carve potatoe-grounds out of, for this has been done already, and is what caused the spirt;—but full of live Kerry-men, with sticks and potatoe-shovels, and Orange lodges and Catholic rent, and police-troops and yeomanry, and all things required to constitute an Irish condition of society. And by parity of reasoning, when a resident turns absentee, he does much the same as if he embarked on his acres instead of a steam-boat, and steered them to Southampton or to Havre de Grace, leaving all the human stock behind but himself. That this, on the principles hitherto involved, has a tendency to diminish the population of Ireland, is undeniable,—but the effect on the general happiness is only temporary; and it is not true that the floating away of the man's acres is the cause of a perpetually recurring infelicity, which is the statement of the opponent. If, for example, the whole county of Norfolk was to be gradually swallowed by the sea, it would produce much temporary suffering, and permanently diminish the political or aggregate power of the British community in nearly the same degree as if all the inhabitants had sunk along with it. But it would not be true that thenceforth for ever, the British community would stand starving and looking for the county of Norfolk; which is the attitude in which Ireland is represented as looking for her absentees. If the proposition was, that Ireland suffered through being too weak;—that it was because she had not political power enough to make herself respected, and to maintain the degree of comparative independence which

would ensure her being well treated;—in this sense there might be some ground for maintaining that the absentees did her a permanent injury. But it has never been understood that this *is* the proposition; and the object is to prevent the miseries of Ireland from being charged to a wrong cause, to the concealment of the true.

If it should be replied, that by this very showing, every act of absenteeism produces evil at the time when it takes place, the answer is, That the opponent has taken credit for the constant action of *the whole*, and that besides this there is another principle to come;—That supposing, for argument's sake, absenteeism to be increasing at the rate of five per cent per annum, he has taken credit for the principal instead of the interest, and consequently the magnitude of his conclusion is at all events to be reduced in the proportion of something like twenty to one. When it is to be established that absenteeism and not misgovernment is the torment of Ireland, a huge sum—"four millions per annum"—is paraded before men's eyes; and what is here contended for is, that it ought in all fairness to be cut down to something like 200,000*l.*

Even if it was true—which it is not—that a country suffers a permanent diminution of political strength and importance by its absentees, this would be no foundation on which to ground a right of restraining absentees, by taxation or otherwise. Such a right might be maintainable, if men were like rabbits in a warren—bred for the purpose of giving their skins and carcases to the warrener. There is no doubt that to a proprietor of this description, absentee rabbits appear to be just subjects for restraint; and he establishes a Preventive Service of furze-bushes on the walls of his domain accordingly. But if there is any ascertained political truth, it is, that men were not born for their hides and tallow, but for the purpose of living as happily as they can; and by a wise disposition of Providence, when they are made miserable they have a propensity to run away. A bounty is thus created in favour of good governments; because a bad one has nobody to govern but those who cannot help it. It would be exceedingly hard if a government could be bad *ad libitum*, and shut up its subjects besides. It has always been considered a harsh measure, when a government prohibits the exit from an infected district; but it would be still harder if it made the plague and the *cordon* too. There is a plague in Ireland, and the government cannot take it away, because it is a vested interest; the resurrection-men would pull anybody to pieces that attempted it. But this is no reason why the government should shut people up besides.

But the great answer on the question of Absenteeism is, that the case would not be mended if the absentees were brought back again; and consequently their absence is not the cause of the ills complained of. If, indeed, the ills could be removed, so as to make men *like* living in Connaught or in Tipperary better than in Paris or in Westminster,—then the effect would be the same as if they could be made to like whiskey and brown ale better than the claret they at present go to drink abroad. But as long as this liking is not produced, to shut them up against their liking is only the fallacy of Colbert. If all the corn in France were exchanged for home-made goods, and none for foreign, what a vast deal of corn there would be! So reasoned the minister; but behold the unreasonableness of the corn-growing part of the community—the corn was not grown. The growers said sensibly enough, 'When we grew corn, it was with a view to obtaining for it the foreign goods we like to consume. It is true, you do not prohibit the importation of the foreign goods; but you prohibit the exportation of our corn, which is the same thing to us in the end.' In the same manner the absentees will say, 'When we encouraged the production of wheat, cattle, and butter at home, it was because we were at liberty to enjoy the results how we pleased, and where we pleased. But if you take away from us the enjoyment, you cannot expect the production to be the same.' It may be replied, as in the case of Colbert, that the producers are obliged to produce by their own interests; and that they will not stop producing, to spite the minister. But the experimental fact is, that they *do* stop; and the organ through which this effect is brought about, is clearly the fall of prices caused by the limitation of their market. What goes to keep the absentees, goes into a foreign market; in the same manner as if it went to buy claret for the same individuals to consume at home. But if the individuals come home, it must either go to buy foreign produce still—in which case there is no difference but that the claret is drunk in one place instead of another; or it must go into the home market, and so the home market in some other direction be diminished by the amount. When, therefore, men lament over the butter, the beef, and the bullocks, and calculate what a world of *tail* they would support if they were only kept in Ireland,—they should reflect, that these things were produced because they could be carried away and sold; and that to sigh over their departure, is like a baker's being sentimental over the loaves that quit his shop, and reckoning the immense meals he might enjoy, if he could only procure an Act of Parliament to make them stay at home.

If this view is correct, it is superfluous to insist further on the necessity of the Catholics being on their guard, against the attempt to give them a stone when they ask for bread. At all events the proposal is suspicious, as coming from their enemies; and recommendations of caution can scarcely proceed from others than their friends.

Any conclusions in favour of free trade, which have been at any time deduced from the proposition advanced before the committee of the House, were true enunciations tacked to a wrong demonstration. The real cause why no community can ever lose by free trade is, that nothing can ever be brought from abroad without something being produced at home to pay for it,—and that all that is given above the cheapest price, must be given by somebody without an equivalent. Whoever desires to see this point illustrated with brevity, and in the best style of the best parts of Adam Smith, will find it in 'Three Lectures on the Mercantile Theory of Wealth, by the Professor of Political Economy in the University of Oxford*.'

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 January, 1829.

ART. XVI. 1. *Some Account of the System of Fagging at Winchester School; with Remarks, and a Correspondence with Dr. Williams, Head-Master of that Public School, on the late Expulsions thence for resistance to the authority of the Præfects.* By Sir Alexander Malet, Bart. Second Edition.—London. Ridgway. 1828. Pamphlet, pp. 23.

2. *A Letter to Sir Alexander Malet, Bart., in reference to his Pamphlet, touching the late Expulsions from Winchester School: with a word, in passing, to the Editor of the Literary Gazette.* By an Old Etonian. ΤΟΤ ΦΑΓΕΙΝ ΤΙ ΒΕΑΤΙΟΝ.—London. Wilson, Royal Exchange. 1829. Pamphlet, pp. 26.

IF education is of any consequence for good or evil, the worst possible training that could be given to the higher classes in any country, would be one that should teach them to be tyrants by beginning with being slaves. How far this extreme case is realized in institutions of our own, may in part be gathered from the publications to which the expulsion of six school-boys from the public school at Winchester has lately given rise. The oppression of about the same number of students at Oxford, founded the Methodists, and gave the Church of England most of the virtue it possesses; and it is possible that out of the present case may grow events, if not of equal magnitude, of

* Published by Murray, 1828.

similarly intolerable tendency. When an oppression is notorious, palpable, avowed,—when it is defended on the ground of its being "part and parcel" of institutions as they are, and likened to mightier evils for the purpose of demonstrating the necessity of upholding both together,—the question of magnitude merges in that of principle, and the contest becomes part of the great struggle of mankind, for good government or for bad, for the right of misrule on one side, and of reform upon the other.

It is hardly necessary to state, that what is called fagging at public schools, consists in the performance of servile offices by the junior boys for the senior. To black shoes is not servile, provided it is done by consent and paid for; but to black shoes under the penalty of being beaten for non-compliance, is slavery in man or boy.

It appears that at Winchester, the eight senior boys are called Præfects, and fag the juniors;

'and that they may have a greater command of their services during meal times, they appoint one of the junior boys with the title of Course Keeper, whose business it is to take care that whilst the Præfects are at breakfast or supper, the juniors sit upon a certain cross-bench at the top of the hall, that they may be forthcoming whenever a Præfect requires any thing to be done.'

The nature of the service for which they sit on this cross-bench, consists in toasting bread for the seniors; each Præfect being waited on by two knights toasters. This duty was usually demanded of the four junior classes; but a scarcity from some cause arising in these forms, the Præfects issued their mandate that the fifth or next higher should take their share. The fifth —upon the same principle that a man who has been kicked yesterday feels aggrieved at being told he is to be kicked again to-day—were inclined to demur; and a boy of the fifth class absented himself,—think of it, aristocracy of England,—did not sit down to toast. When ordered by the senior Præfect to put himself in the seat of the toasters, 'he refused to do so, and argued the point as a matter of right, referring to the Course Keeper as the depository of the rules, and expressing himself prepared to abide by his decision.' The Course Keeper decided against him; upon which the Præfect determined to punish the contumely of the appellant by beating; and a second Præfect laid hold of him in aid. Whereon 'a simultaneous movement'— awful thing, simultaneous movement— 'took place among the juniors, who pinioned the two Præfects, released the boy who was being beaten, and gave them to understand that the intended chastisement should not be inflicted.'

Now all this would be of comparatively little note, if it was a mere boyish contest for superiority. But no; it was a weightier thing than that; the whole system of juvenile slavery, from Winchester to Eton, and from Eton to the Land's End, was in danger. The Præfects laid their complaint before the Head Master, who expelled the boy who had refused to toast, and five others who had appeared most active in preventing the Præfects from punishing him. Amongst the number was the brother of Sir Alexander Malet; who endeavoured, though without success, to procure his reinstatement in the school. Two letters of Sir Alexander on this subject are given in the pamphlet; with the reply of the Head Master to the first. In this reply, there is a total sinking of the fact, that the Præfects were only resisted in the perpetration of a gross outrage; a point which the replicant ought to have known, and which he must have known if he had made the slightest investigation.

'The authority of the Præfects is, as you well know, essential to the maintenance of discipline in the School; and it is impossible that they can exercise that authority with effect, if they are not protected from the danger of personal outrage. If they, or any of them, exceed the line of their duty, or commit any wrong act, they are liable to censure and punishment from the master; and if any boy think himself aggrieved, he may prefer his complaint in the proper quarter, with a certainty that it will meet with due attention. But he cannot on any account be permitted to use force against those whom he is bound to obey.'

The doctrine therefore is, that he is to be beaten and mended afterwards; a creed which the Head Master himself would not submit to if he could help it, though a jury of Head Masters should be ready to award him damages.

But the whole story would have wanted relief, if it had not been for the second pamphlet. Winchester, it should seem, is "*paries proximus*" to Eton; and when one begins to smoke, it is time for the other to stir. So Dr. Syntax in person trots forth on his classical hobby, to put down the heterodox baronet by likening him to Daniel O'Connell.

'It seems (and I judge, and can judge, only from your own statement) that certain regulations have existed in Winchester School from time immemorial, and form part and parcel of the whole system. Sundry high-minded youths, utterly unable to endure matters so derogatory to their dignity, kicked, like the Catholics of Ireland, against the pricks, and magnanimously resolved to shake off the galling yoke.' &c.

'But, alas! short was the triumph, and but brief the joy! Those indomitable heroes, who, like Daniel O'Connell and his crew, had

taken the law into their own hands, to redress their imaginary grievances, found, as all real Englishmen trust that O'Connell and his friends will find to their cost, that they were at once resolutely banished from the scene of their illegal and unconstitutional violence.'

It is enough. The writer is a "part and parcel" man. Cheese-toasting is the constitution, and the constitution is cheese-toasting.—The Editor of the Literary Gazette too, comes in for the tail of the storm. He had expressed some feeling for the sufferers; and had said something about 'obeying the dirtiest command.' Whereupon he is thus put down:—

'But this show of deep feeling, this pity for the numbers of delicate youths mercilessly slaughtered under this atrocious system, all goes down and does its work. Kind matrons and tender fathers incontinently shudder, and groan deeply at this terrible sacrifice of British lives; public schools are looked upon as sinks of misery and iniquity, a set of Spartan ἀπόβιται, from which their dear children will never return alive and uninjured; they ponder on shivering bed-warmers, and burning cheese-toasters, and black shoe-cleaners, and dirty servants-of-all-work, until their loathing becomes ungovernable; and then

Rises from earth to sky the cry of woe:
Then shriek the timid and stand still the brave;

and then rushes forth a storm of mournful indignation at such inhuman atrocities.'

'But, Sir, in all this tornado of *liberal* sentiments, where are the returns of the killed, wounded, and missing in these battles with tyranny and oppression?'

Now the allegation never was, that people were killed outright and by the shortest way; but that they were exposed to injuries and sufferings enough to make life bitter, and sometimes to shorten it,—as is always the case where human beings have nothing to trust to but the moderation of their tyrants. Hear an evidence. A great man whose name will live*, when the memory of fagging institutions is only preserved like that of Mammoths by their bones,—has furnished in writing the following reminiscence. One of the senior boys in the college at Westminster had a disease; what is technically called *syphilis*;—and like Job, he scraped himself,—whether with a potsherd is not told. But how shall the rest be said;—in what words, which are the symbols of ideas, shall the information be conveyed? If Job when he scraped himself *had made the devil eat it*, he would have done to him what this senior boy did to his fag, by way of punishment for some supposed offence. He

* Jeremy Bentham.—*Added in* 1839.

put the *squamae* of the *cicatrix* into a glass of water, and made the junior swallow it. ΤΟΥ ΦΑΓΕΙΝ ΤΙ ΒΕΑΤΙΟΝ;—think of that, at your dinners of three courses! Think of that, 'kind matrons and tender fathers,' when you send your children to schools, where though it is true the detestable instance here stated happened seventy years ago, the customs that produced it still exist, and are defended as "part and parcel" of the whole.

Imagine now a 'kind matron or tender father,' sending a boy to school and saying, 'Go forth, fair scion, to learn what shall make you great in future story. And first, you shall toast bread, and next black shoes; and then you shall steal geese, and if you resist, fair scion, shall be kicked. And thus you shall come back, your country's hope and parents' glory,—and join the galaxy of worth, who have walked through the same discipline to never-dying fame.'

But let not Winchester fear. There is no idea of mending it. As was said of Pope and his crooked back, it is much easier to make a new one. The middle classes, with a portion of the highest, have already risen up against such folly, and founded the University of London. Even while this is being written, the Quarterly Review* gives up the case of fagging, and leaves the "part and parcel" men to make their defence themselves. The new institution is the legitimate produce of the disgust universally entertained for the absurdities of the old ones. It has risen triumphantly through all the opposition and scurrility of its enemies; and five hundred and thirty students is no contemptible number for an opening muster. Heaven knows what diseases, in this great metropolis, may at some time or other find their way into the University of London; but of this men may rest tolerably sure,—that there will none be *eaten*. The new University now only wants one addition, to ensure its victory over the worn out and the corrupt; and that is, *a junior branch*. At present, there are few restrictions upon age; but there are on the degrees of knowledge. What is wanted, is an organization for commencing with boys at the same point at which they are taken by the public schools,—or with the first rudiments of learning, after the reading of their mother language. Such an addition to the original plan,—aided by a junction of the improvements of Hamilton and Lancaster, which there seems to be no impossibility in accomplishing,—would prevent youth from being engaged at all in the servile and degrading trammels of the old institutions, and give the decided victory to the new. If any

* Quarterly Review for January, 1829. No. 77. Art. on Elementary Teaching.

false pride, or attachment to the pomp and circumstance of glorious antiquity, prevents the execution of such a plan,—it will only be an instance of the gradual progress by which all improvements must advance,—and men must be thankful for what they have, and live in hope of that which they have not.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 April, 1829.

ART. V.—1. *Three Letters to the Editor of the Edinburgh Weekly Journal, from Malachi Malagrowther, Esq., on the proposed Change of Currency, and other late alterations, as they affect, or are intended to affect, the Kingdom of Scotland.*—Blackwood, Edinburgh. Cadell, London.

2. *The Scotch Banker; containing Articles under that signature, on Banking, Currency, &c. republished from the Globe Newspaper. With some additional Articles.*—Ridgway, London.

REASON is getting the better of the world so fast, that there appears to be no reason why something reasonable should not be uttered on the subject of Banking. Time was, when everything that was said by a man in a good pair of boots, passed for gospel; and nobody that wore good boots was on the side of the people. But such times are gone by like the Test act—superannuated like 'our Protestant constitution.' The Radicals, and the rats, have made an end of them, and old gentlemen sigh over their reminiscences, as over the memory of their departed pig-tails;

> 'They cannot but remember such things were,
> That were most precious to them.'

The world has gained in experience. Whenever there is a contest on a public question, it assumes without danger of mistake, that one side has a secret to keep, and the other has something to explain if it knew how. There is invariably some small hole letting day-light on the subject, which one party could open if they would, and the other would open if they could. In the present case the revelation is not far to seek; for it happens fortunately that the tough and didactic matter has been given in a preceding article*, to which it will be sufficient to refer.

There was a time when there were neither banks nor currency. To doubt it would be heresy. For it is clear that in the earliest state of man there were no pockets; the first mention of anything capable of holding them, is not till after-

* Article on the 'Instrument of Exchange.' Westminster Review for 1 Jan. 1825. *See Appendix.*

wards. And from the possession of pockets to that of anything to put in them, is, as all men know, a dreary hiatus, capable of indefinite extension and delay. But what was not, and is, must have had a beginning; there was therefore a time when men began to use an instrument of exchange. And the first discovery they would make on this subject, would be that *anything* which more people wanted than could be supplied with it for nothing, might serve for an instrument of exchange at some rate or other. If it was as cumbrous, for instance, as a waggon-load of straw—or anything else that may be fixed on as the most awkward of possible instruments—it is still clear that it would fetch *something*. There can be no doubt, for example, that it would fetch the value of what we call a halfpenny; and therefore it might be used instead of a halfpenny, if anybody chose to be at the trouble. And the next discovery would be, that what it was received for, would be equal to what could be got for it from a retailer who bought it to sell again, *minus* the value of all the trouble, expense, and risk, attendant on its conveyance to him; the consequence of which would be, to hold out a direct premium in favour of the use of such things as gave the least trouble—or in other words, the precious metals. What makes the metals precious, is evidently that men like them and they are scarce. That men like them for the instrument of exchange, may be one part of the liking; but the main source of the love for them, will be their desirableness for other purposes. That silver will make sixpences, may be one reason why men desire silver; but the principal reason undoubtedly is, that they desire silver spoons.

The first use of the precious metals in exchange would be by weight. Abraham had got thus far, when he 'weighed to Ephron the silver, four hundred shekels of silver, current with the merchant*;'—the earliest mention of currency, undoubtedly, in history. But the next observation would be, that much trouble would be saved, if the fineness and weight were authenticated by the external appearance; and that to do this with effect, the issue must be confined to the governing power. And this is the invention of *coins*.

When a government—Pharaoh's for instance—began to issue coins, the rate at which they would be received in the market *would rise*. For every man would be glad to take the coin, for what he expected to get for it again, *plus* the value of the expense, trouble, or risk, he might save by taking it instead of anything else. The value of this saving might only

* Genesis xxiii. 16.

be a farthing; but he would take the coin for a farthing more than he expected to pass it for again. He might pass it for a farthing less than he took it; but he would have saved a farthing's worth of trouble, which repays him in the end. And the consequence of this farthing premium will be, that the exchangeable value of the coin *will rise and rise.* This looks very much like a fallacy, and is not; and whoever chuses to enter into the minutiæ of the question, may see it examined at full length in the article before alluded to. And it will rise till one of two things happens;—till either it has risen so high that the existing supply of coins is sufficient to conduct all the exchanges of the community, and so an end is put to further competition,—or till the anxiety of men to procure coins by adding the farthing to the market rate, is balanced by a fear that the rate may fall about their ears before the coins are out of their possession. Hence there is a height to which the rate will rise, and a height to which it will not rise. And at this rate, whatever it is, the coins will go on till the quantity issued is sufficient for them to be employed in all exchanges. What this quantity will be, must depend on the magnitude of the concerns of the society. It will be a quantity which may be considered as the same from day to day, though it may not be the same from year to year, or even from month to month. It may be assumed to be constant as long as no remarkable change takes place in the wealth and occupations of the society; but will increase if the wealth and occupations should increase, and diminish if they are diminished.

If at this point the issues should be increased, *the market rate of coins would fall.* And the reason is, that an increased quantity of coins must be brought into the market in demand for goods of some kind or other, and consequently the price of goods must rise, or, which is the same thing, the value of coins fall. And the point to which it would fall, would be that which would make the whole number exactly sufficient for the supply as before;—the extended proof of which may be found in the place last referred to. In this way, if the issues go on, the rate will fall till it is brought to the value of the metal. And if the issues are still increased, the slightest fall below the metal value will cause coins to be restored to their original uses as metal, and consequently the coins will begin to disappear. The overlooking or concealing this fall in the rate, is the fallacy of Sir John Sinclair and the money-jugglers—the *perpetual motionists*, who say 'Make money and people must consume,' without finding out that their project must evaporate through the

simple fact of the increased quantity coming to the same value as the old.

If a government chuses to issue pieces of paper with a certain value, as, for instance, a drachm of gold, or a bushel of wheat, specified on each,—delivering them in its payments in lieu of the commodities specified, and engaging to take them again in discharge of taxes for the same value,—these pieces of paper may be used instead of coins; and if, after the rate (of the coins and paper together) has been reduced to the metal value of the coin, the issues are further increased, a corresponding quantity of coins will be returned to the vulgar uses of gold watches or silver spoons. And for every piece of paper so issued, the value is in the hands of the issuer, which is the government; while at the same time the gold and silver returned to vulgar uses, go to the benefit, not of the government, but of the public as distinguished from the government. The most inconsiderable fall below the metal value, causes coins to go out; but as all that go out are paid for to the holders, and the public have still a currency as before, the public, who are the holders, are the gainers of the amount. There is no mystery in the business. A bit of paper is made to serve the purpose of gold and silver; and as the gold and silver must have been found and paid for by the community in some shape and at some time, so their value goes back to the community or to some part of it when they are dispensed with, which is as it ought to be. An operation is performed like what takes place when a family resolves to drink out of glass instead of silver. The glass serves the purpose of drinking as well; and since the family is paid for the old silver when it goes into the melting-pot, it is plain that the value of it goes to the family.

But what seems never to have been thought of till what was called the stoppage of the Bank of England in 1797, is that these pieces of paper may and will keep their value, or at all events a certain value, though the government should make no pretence, or in other words should utterly refuse, to pay them in any manner or form, other than by taking them for the taxes. Men gazed at one another when this discovery was made,—being at a loss to comprehend how the letters *BANK* over a government house in Thread-needle Street, should convey any different consequences from the same letters over a private house in their county-town. But it is obvious enough now, that the things are totally dissimilar, bating the letters and the paint. In short it is established by experiment, which determines everything, that a government may say 'Let this bit of paper

go for a guinea,' and it will go accordingly,—*subject always to the same laws with respect to the greater or less quantity of the issues*, as would take place if there were guineas instead of paper, and they could not be melted or otherwise transformed.

But if the government issues a greater number of these bits of paper than are wanted to supply the circulation at the value inscribed upon them, the prices of goods must rise, or the value of the paper fall, on the same principles as in the case of coins. And if these issues go on, it is manifest that the amount of the superfluous issues must, from time to time, be taken out of the pockets of the holders of the circulating medium at large, by the value of the increased quantity being continually reduced to the value of the old;—and further that a huge robbery must be made out of the fund-holders, by paying them with a paper with the same value written on it in words, but which has been made of a less real value, for the express purpose of keeping the difference. This was the Pitt fraud; the fraud of him for whom men still meet and huzza, because they would like to do the same again. He took, on a moderate computation, thirty-seven millions from the stock-holders, and eight millions and a half from the holders of the circulating medium; of which last sum not quite five millions were allowed to go to the private bankers, as a mode of securing their acquiescence in the transaction. The amount can be calculated to sixpence, if only the data can be obtained; and these are the results from the data, as nearly as they can be had. Everybody knows what is done with a man who takes twenty shillings; but forty-five millions is a different thing, and besides, it was taken to prevent a reform in parliament.

Whoever has got the length of understanding the preceding statement, is able to enter into the question now pending on the subject of the currency. As usual, it is a question whether somebody shall rob the public or shall not; and you and I and everybody, are the public, who are to be robbed or the contrary, according as we have the wit to take care of ourselves. The Bank of England is, or ought to be, the agent of the public. It is the government's banking-shop, which means the community's banking-shop; in the same way that the Victualling Office is the community's pork and beef shop. It is the place where the community banks on its own account; as the other is the place where it buys pork and beef. Or if it is not this, it ought to be; and it is only through some trick that it is not. Let the construction of the Bank of England be beset with mysteries, as thick as rogues in Newgate,—and still it either is the agent of the public, or it ought to be. It may

carry on its operations through the intervention of a contract more or less fair, or through a greater or less quantity of job and consequently of dishonesty; but still it is as immutable as one of nature's laws, that let its estate be as bad as it may, one part of what it does is for the public, and the remainder is fraud.

This being settled, it is clear that whether the Bank of England is exactly what it ought to be, is a removeable part of the question,—a part that may be set aside to a convenient season, without interfering with the case just now before the jury of the public. The Bank of England stands forward as the representative of the banking-office of the community,—the place where the community issues its paper instead of gold, and puts the difference of cost into its own community pockets. If it is not all this, *make it so.* There is no doubt that the agents are paid; perhaps they are paid ten times over. But let this be settled another time,—do not let it stay the hearing of the present cause. The Bank of England then—by a fiction perhaps—is the public. And the public can make a saving of, it may be, forty millions, by issuing its paper to that amount instead of gold. Hereupon stand up an order of men, and say that *they* will have half of the public saving; and the reason is, that they will issue the paper. They say it is their trade,—and how hard it is to keep a man out of his trade? They might just as well demand to take the pitch and tar out of the dock-yards; and say it was their trade to keep a cart and horse to carry them away. What they demand is, to carry off a portion—some twenty millions perhaps—of the gold and silver which were bought and paid for by the community; by substituting their own paper instead of the paper of the community. They say they will buy paper and black it with ink, and fit up a room with desks and high stools, and *therefore* they will carry away the money; just as the other man says he will fit out a cart, and pay for greasing the wheels, and therefore he will carry away the pitch out of the dock-yards. There is not an atom of difference between the two things in reality; and all the differences that are alleged, are only of that kind of mystification in which consists the art of public wrong. They say, for instance, that they are bound to pay in gold if the public demands it, and that they can only keep out their paper in proportion to their credit and their wealth. But this does not affect the fact, that they mean to divide twenty millions of the public property among themselves. The people who are interested in their having no more paper than they can pay, and the people who are interested in their having *no paper at all,*

are different sets. John complains that he is robbed, and the answer is that Thomas cares nothing about it.

The simple truth is, that the business of a private banker is to keep people's money, as the London bankers do; and to lend *his own* money if he likes it; but not to *make* money, or in other words take the money of the public. Every private banker's note in existence, is a demonstration of so much that has been taken out of the pocket of the community with license of the government, and applied to private use; in the same manner as if barrels of pitch with the king's mark, were found running about private dock-yards, from a similar spirit of diffusive benevolence. What is given in return, may be surmised in one case as it would be in the other;—love, good-will, support of the great interest, propping of church and state, hatred of 'radicals,' which means those who would hinder it. If it is not so, why not stop it?

Whenever the community is to be robbed, the art is to demonstrate to each individual that he gains a shilling, though the community is charged for it a pound. This is the *be-all* and *end-all* of public fraud; and he who understands it, knows the whole mechanism of that dignified dishonesty, which it is not the custom to visit with the penalties of law. This is at the bottom of the opposition to Free Trade, and of the Corn Laws; and till men cease babbling of their wisdom and their ancestors,—and find out that they are great fools, the sons of greater, and just beginning to feel their way out of a system where they were robbed in all directions through their own ignorance and folly,—the robberies must go on.

The principles given above, are either wrong or right. If they are not wrong, they open a ready way through wildernesses of groundless assumption and interested perplexity. They demonstrate, that the Letters containing such valiant words of "out claymore, and down wi' gun," were only an exhortation to the sonsy and twice-thinking Scots, to threaten a civil war in defence of the privilege of being plundered. If men had been invited to do this for anything but a fraud and a wrong, it would have been called treason; for treason is the Tory's *wife*, what other men can sin withal but not himself. The right of insurrection is sacred, when the people are to be injured; ill only when they are to be preserved from injury. It is worth remembering, that it was not *we* but the Ultra Tories, that proposed insurrection as the means of settling a question with the government about bank-notes. They may depend upon it they shall have enough of "pipe and drum" if the time comes; but they may as well have patience till it

does. If they do not have their way, the king "shall not sit upon his throne!" *They* hinder the king from sitting on his throne?—when, stand but the Horse Guards neuter, and the poor "radicals" as they are called,—the men in black beards and greasy coats, the food for yeomanry, the dust the Corn-law mill throws round it in its course,—would read them such a lesson, as should make them forswear politics and addict themselves to partridge eggs, for the rest of their natural existence. Power may be sublime, and malevolence terrific; but malevolence without power, is a chained baboon, the dread of women, the mock of boys, the ugliest and least respectable inmate in the whole garden of Zoology.

To the original wrong by which the whole amount of private notes is taken from the public, are to be added the inevitable evils which arise from their defect of payment. All the sufferings—and they are immeasurable—which have arisen to parts and portions of the public from the failure of private banks, are the result of the "pitch and tar" system,—of the practice of allowing the public property to be taken by individuals for their own use. The putting down the private *one-pound* notes, is a step towards the further justice of putting down the private paper altogether; and then the government will be at liberty to consider the practicability of giving the value of the metallic currency to those who are the owners.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 April, 1829.

ART. X.—1. *An Introductory Lecture delivered in the University of London, on Tuesday, November* 11, 1828. By Hyman Hurwitz, Professor of the Hebrew Language and Literature.—London. John Taylor, 1828.

2. *Statement of the Civil Disabilities and Privations affecting the Jews in England.* Printed by George Taylor, Lamb's Conduit Passage, Red Lion Square.

BIGOTRY must have a nest egg. By which word bigotry, is not meant believing that one religion is better than another,—for that we all do;—but believing that one man has a right to oppress and injure another, for differing from him in religion. In short it means the creed of religious highwaymen and pious pickpockets, who claim to intromit with their neighbour's purse and person, *quia* he differeth in faith.

When a man cannot have what he would, it is well known he must be content with what he may. If he is unable to pro-

cure the savoury meat his soul loveth, he must stoop to imitation venison, of anything that chews the cud or parts the hoof. If there is no persecuting a Catholic or a Dissenter to his satisfaction, he must try what sweetness there is in a Quaker or a Jew. They are both of them inviting sects. They have a Treasury, but no Ordnance; and it is in the fitness of things that they should be treated with injury accordingly. We are all thieves, by nature and by practice; and like the thieves that go to Bow-street, we rob only where we dare, and let it alone where we think we had better not. A Quaker, for instance, may be robbed with impunity, provided none but Quaker eyes behold it. If the robber should go further, and after breaking into his house, cut his son's throat, and violate every female in his family before his face,—the law, which is the perfection of reason, is that there shall be no remedy. It is 'crowner's quest law,' that what Sir Walter Scott calls the five pleas of the Crown, may be severally acted on the persons of a whole Quakers' meeting at once, provided none of the government faith are in a situation to give evidence. And this not because anybody doubts, or affects to doubt, the evidence of the sufferers. It is acknowledged on all hands, that if there is any part of the human race whose word would be taken on any given subject with more confidence than another's, these are they *par excellence*. It is not because any man would be insane enough to say he doubted their deposition; but it is because society in this country is not formed for the purpose of mutual protection, but for the purpose of securing certain advantages to the class that happens to be strongest; which is what, for the time being, is called the orthodox.

The Quakers are a *hors d'œuvre;* the business at present is with the Jews. A Jew is a primitive Dissenter; the earliest on record, except one. It is plain, therefore, that he is the Devil's next of kin; and that his teeth, lips, hips, nose, toes, and all the rest of his judicial members, are held, and always have been, *durante bene placito* of the true believers. Men mock at this term when they find it in the mouth of a Mohammedan; but why should not men be persuaded of the truth of their own faith in one country, as well as in another? It is as clear as Euclid, that the question is only one of place and numbers; for there may be found a hundred different kinds of 'true believers,' all claiming to be such on the strength of being strongest on the muster-roll. *Truth* is quite a different subject; the real Simon may be found some day; but till he is, it would be policy that all the family of Pures should keep their hands out of their neighbours' pockets, and walk with

as little jostling as they can, till they come to the grand denouement.

Suppose, now, some man at Charing Cross should say, that he was the real owner of everything that passed that thoroughfare, and though he did not mean to take it all, he would take what he thought fit;—that he was the true man, he knew he was,—and therefore he would act upon his knowledge. What argument could be brought on such a claim, that does not hold on that of the 'true believer?' The true believer says, he acts upon his certain knowledge that he is right. So does the man at Charing Cross. Other people urge, that his conviction is not theirs. The true believer answers calmly, that it is because they are in the wrong. The passengers begin to grumble, and say it is not for the good of the world at large that one man should assume such an authority, and if one does another may. Our true believer marches on, and says that while he has broad shoulders he will try the question. This is the 'ultima ratio' of orthodoxy all the world over. No man was ever found declaring himself orthodox, till he was strong. Sectaries are not orthodox, because they are only strong enough to be sectaries; it is precisely for the same reason that frigates are not line-of-battle ships. It was once great odds, whether 'the Uncreated Light of Mount Tabor' did not *faire fortune* in theology; and if it had, we should all have been Quaternitarians, and Quaternitarians would have been the orthodox. In all possible countries, orthodoxy is as it were matter of luck. A dynasty shall be a good dynasty on one side of the water, and on the other it shall be *damnatae memoriae* by virtue of a flank movement. The syllogism of orthodoxy is one of extreme simplicity; for its major, minor, and conclusion, are nothing but 'horse and dragoons.' It is the theological version of

> 'The good old rule, the simple plan,
> That they should take, who have the power,
> And they should keep who can.'

It is true that orthodoxy, like the small-pox and everything else, has become milder than it used to be. Nobody has been burnt at York, since the Minster; and the present Mr. Rothschild has his full number of *molares*. But the spirit is the spirit still. A foot-pad might as well plead that he is not Robin Hood,—as modern bigotry expect to escape, by urging that it lacks the splendours of the burning time. The Corporation of London leaves Mr. Goldsmid's teeth alone, because they are of no use to it; but why did it take 500*l.* out of his gaberdine when he was made a broker? Jews are not roasted now; but

why should not a Jew roast and boil, in the way of his honest industry, within the city like another man? The secret is out; they want Mr. Huskisson in the city. It is part of the plot against trade; we are to be deprived of the Jews' industry, that somebody else may be the better for it. Nine tenths of existing evils, and ninety-nine hundredths of the remainder, solve themselves into the robbery of Jack to please Tom, and the public for everybody. Every restriction inflicted on a Jew, on pretence of his being what Dr. Southey calls a 'misbeliever,' is a request to take something out of the public purse, for the benefit of the pious people who ask it. If the Jew is to be put out, it is because it would be for the advantage of the public that he should stay in. If not, there would be no competition, and consequently no reason to wish him out. A Jew that should keep a retail shop, could only hold his ground by being pleasing to his customers; and why are we, the good Christians, to be deprived of the retail shop that pleases us? If a Jew sold naughty figs, or made his bread with the leaven of the Scribes and Pharisees, his customers would leave him, and the Jew would starve. But there is no need to call in the Thirty-nine Articles, for the regulation of groceries and the protection of penny rolls. Men had both, without the Thirty-nine Articles; and might have them still.

Some people think Jews are foreigners, because there are foreign Jews. This is a mistake; which it may be hoped will be cured, when there is a King's College in the metropolis. The Jews are as true-born Englishmen as one half of the nobility. If any person is scrupulous on the subject of a 'True-born Englishman,' he may consult De Foe. It is laughable to hear true-born Englishmen question the title of a Jew, whose ancestors came into the country with Charles II. Why is not population in Spital-fields declared to be *extra quatuor maria;* or a German sugar-baker in Whitechapel proclaimed incapable of propagating an Englishman? If one can make natural-born subjects, the other can; or if not, the difference is not in nature but in persecution.

What persecutors can never find out, is that other people besides the persecuted are injured by them. It is past their comprehension, that when a Quaker is stricken on the face, or a Jew smitten in the hinder parts, the corresponding nerves in any good Christians should vibrate by sympathy. They never take into their account, that the injury is in the insult, and that the insult is to all. Decent people cannot live comfortably among violence and wrong, even though there is a compact to abstain from their peculiar dwellings. If an individual

householder sets up a house of ill fame, the street must unite to burn him out; and there is no use in the plea, that he did not carry his iniquity into each man's particular parlour, or that reverend men were not invited to be his partners unless they chose. There is a moral stain in the *permission* of persecution; a species of complicity, in living in a country where it takes place. Weakness excuses everything; but the public will is strong enough to curb all persecutors, and therefore the responsibility has begun.

The history of the Jews as it relates to the present subject, is briefly and well given in the "Statement of Disabilities and Privations, &c."

'Their first appearance in England as a body, and in any number, was at the period of the Norman Invasion, although it is equally certain that individuals of their nation sojourned here under some of the Saxon Monarchs; allusion to them being made in some ecclesiastical muniments in the year 740, and again in 833.

'The early Chronicles, from the Conquest downwards, afford a frightful series of atrocious massacres and persecutions to which the Jews were from time to time subjected, according to the caprice or avarice of the Sovereign, and the ignorance and bigotry of the people.

'They were during this period considered the immediate property of the Crown, and were specifically reserved as such in more than one Royal Charter *; in this character they were occasionally the objects of some special immunities and privileges, granted, it should seem, with the view of allowing scope to their commercial enterprise, for which they, by their foreign relations, had many facilities, and that they might thus by their habitual tendency to accumulate wealth, afford a more valuable prey to their Royal Masters, who, in some cases, after extorting to the uttermost farthing from their unhappy victims, sold them to a subject; they were thus transferred by Henry III to his brother Richard Duke of Cornwall, in order that, as the Chronicler relates, "whom the former had flayed, the latter might eviscerate."

'Traces are found in Parliamentary, Municipal, and Fiscal Records, of various alternations of persecution and protection, affording matter of interest to the Antiquarian and Historian; but for the present purpose it may suffice to state, that only one statute relating to this people, and which was passed during the first period of their settlement in England, remains specifically unrepealed: it is of uncertain date, although attributed to 3d Edward I, and having been long considered obsolete, remains in the original Law French, without any

* 'In Henry 3rd's Charter to the City of London, granted on the 26th March, in the 52nd year of his reign, the exception runs thus, "But as touching our Jews and Merchant Strangers, and other things out of our foresaid grant, touching us, or our said City, we and our heirs shall provide as to us shall seem expedient."

translation attached, and is only to be met with in the appendix to Ruffhead's Statutes*.

'Within a very few years from the passing of that act, and after enduring every species of the most aggravated cruelty and oppression, the Jews were, in the year 1290, banished the kingdom by a Royal Proclamation, under the standing pretence of grinding the poor by their usurious dealings, and they departed accordingly, to the number, as is computed, of 16,500 persons.

'So general and complete must have been the exile of the Jews, that no mention whatever of them occurs in our annals for the long interval of near 400 years, or until after 1656, when Cromwell, on the petition on their behalf of Manasseh Ben Israel, a Physician, in Holland, highly distinguished for his scientific knowledge, was induced, as is supposed, to agree to their re-establishment in England; but such consent, if given, does not appear to have been then acted on, as in 1663, the whole number of Jews in London did not exceed twelve; in the years immediately following, however, a great influx of them took place, although sanctioned by no special permission, and in consequence it was held, on an elaborate argument in the case of The East India Company v. Sand, that the Jews reside in England only by an implied licence, which on a proclamation of banishment, would operate like a determination of letters of safe conduct to an alien enemy.—(2 Show. 371.)

'The Jews on such their re-establishment, were spared the direct hardships and inflictions they had endured during their former settlement here, but notwithstanding had to encounter much illiberality and jealousy on the part of the principal Merchants of London, who, in 1685, petitioned James II to insist on the Alien Duty of Customs being exacted from all Jews, notwithstanding their having obtained letters of denization; similar petitions were presented from the Hamburgh Company, the Eastland Company, and the Merchants of the West and North of England, but the King, as his brother Charles II had before done, refused to comply with the prayer of such petitions. The merchants renewed their application in 1690 to William III, when, after much discussion before the Privy Council, an order was issued, the effect of which was, to render the Jews liable to the Alien Duty.

'Upon this the Merchants drew up a most loyal address of thanks to the King, and no further notice appears to have been taken of the Jews until the 1st year of Queen Anne, when, it being represented to both Houses of Parliament that the severity of Jewish parents towards such of their children as were desirous of embracing the Christian faith, was a great hindrance to their conversion, it was enacted, (Stat. 1 Anne, c. 30) that "if the child of any Jewish parent is converted to the Christian religion, or is desirous of embracing it, upon application

* 'This Act is commented upon by Daines Barrington, in his observations on the Statutes, and by him considered obsolete; in point of fact, it may be doubted whether it was not virtually repealed by 37th Henry VIII cap. 9, which, in the most comprehensive words, repeals all previous Acts relating to usury; the restraint of which was the chief, if not the only, object of the Act of 3rd Edward I in question.'

to the Lord Chancellor, he may compel any such parent to give his child a sufficient maintenance in proportion to his circumstances."

'Early in the following reign a Petition was presented to the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of London, praying that no Jew might be admitted a Broker: no order or bye-law seems to have been made upon such petition, which comprised only the most futile allegations.

'In an Act passed 10th Geo. I. c. 4, providing for the administering the oath of abjuration for the purposes contemplated by that statute, the following clause was introduced in favour of the Jews: "Whenever any of his Majesty's subjects professing the Jewish religion shall present himself to take the oath of abjuration, the words, 'upon the true faith of a Christian,' shall be omitted out of the said oath." This provision, exclusive of the very proper object of it, is so far additionally valuable, as affording the first legislative recognition of the relation of Sovereign and Subject as regards the Jews born within the British dominions; and they are also, as such, included in the Act of 13th Geo. II. c. 7, which enacts, that every Jew who shall have resided seven years in any of his Majesty's Colonies in America, shall, upon taking the oath of abjuration, qualified as above, be entitled to all the privileges of a natural-born subject of Great Britain.

'Following up the preceding provision, whereby naturalization was thus effected without requiring that, in compliance with the Act of 7th James I the party applying to be naturalized should first receive the sacrament, the famous Act for permitting persons professing the Jewish religion to be naturalized by Parliament, was passed in 1753, 26th Geo. II. c. 26. The principal clauses of which were, that Jews, upon application to Parliament, might be naturalized without taking the sacrament; that they must have resided three years in England or Ireland; and for disabling them, notwithstanding, from purchasing or inheriting any advowson or right of patronage in the Church.

'It would now be scarcely credible, were it not matter of authentic history, that this mere permission given to the Legislature to naturalize such foreign Jews as might apply, being qualified as above mentioned, excited such a ferment throughout the country, as to accelerate a Session of Parliament for the purpose of passing, as its first Act, (27 Geo. II. c. 1,) a repeal of the Act in question, stating by way of reason in the preamble, "that occasion had been taken from the said Act to raise discontents, and to disquiet the minds of many of his Majesty's subjects."

'By the 26th Geo. II. c. 33, commonly called the Marriage Act, the Jews and Quakers are the only communities specially excepted out of the operation of it.

'Mr. Serjeant Heywood, in his valuable book on County Elections, has the following words: "Since their return (after being banished by Edw. I), Jews have been possessed of *real* estates, without molestation; and notwithstanding the doubts thrown out in both Houses of Parliament in 1753, may, I conceive, vote at county elections, upon taking the oaths, according to the ceremonies of their religion, as they are always permitted to do, when sworn in the Courts of Justice."

'The result of the foregoing review of the public and legislative proceedings with reference to the Jews in England, appears most distinctly to prove that, with the single exception of the Act of Anne, as affecting parental control, and under which not more than two or three applications have ever been made in Chancery, there is no disabling statute whatsoever affecting the claim of his Majesty's subjects professing the Jewish religion to a full and equal participation with their Christian fellow-subjects in the reciprocal rights and privileges consequent upon the obligation and duty of allegiance as natural-born subjects of the Imperial Crown of the United Kingdom, including the power to acquire, inherit, possess, convey, and transmit every species of property, real as well as personal; subject only, in common with all Dissenters, to the restrictions imposed by the Test and Corporation Acts *, in respect of qualification for certain official and municipal situations.

'Having thus satisfactorily established the fact, that there is no particular Act of Parliament affecting the free and unfettered power of the English Jews to pursue the fair and free course of industry and talent, in common with their countrymen, it is the more to be regretted, that any impediment should be thrown in their way by any local regulations; and most of all, that such impediments should have originated, and may still be found to exist, in the city of London.

'The great and important privation the Jews thus experience, arising apparently from custom, and that a bad one, as capriciously and illegally excluding one class of his Majesty's subjects from a privilege afforded to all others, is the circumstance of the Corporation of the City of London refusing to grant its freedom to professed Jews, who are thus rendered incapable of keeping open shop in the City for retail of goods. This is not only a serious privation to a numerous and industrious class of individuals so excluded merely on account of difference of religious faith; but operates also to the detriment of the public, who lose the benefit of the more active competition, which might otherwise in several trades be thus advantageously excited.

'The more enlightened policy which has of late actuated the Corporation of London, will, there is every reason to expect, induce a revision of all such narrow and exclusive restrictions as may remain among their bye-laws, or regulations, and by rescinding them, give full scope to the energy of Trade, unshackled by any undue preference, interference, or control, and claiming no other patronage than the all-sufficient boon of public confidence as the reward of private honesty.'

Since the publication of the above, considerable alterations have been made in the law as it affects Dissenters in general. And there appears to be no doubt that by these alterations, the civil disabilities of the Jews are removed to as great an extent

* Published before the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts. Other alterations have taken place since the Article itself was published. Among them, the Quakers have been relieved from their inability to give evidence in criminal cases.—*Added on republication in* 1839.

as those of any other Dissenters, *if they would take the test.* That there is nothing in the test which they need or ought to stick at, was powerfully and unanswerably argued by Lord Winchilsea in the House of Lords*; and the acquiescence with which the arguments of his lordship were received, is evidence that no invasion of the intentions of the legislature would be committed, by a Jew coming forward to take the oath in the sense then and there laid down. 'The true faith of a Christian,' as most honourably and undisguisedly defined by the noble lord, means nothing but so much of what is called Christianity, as the deponent believes to be true. Everybody knows that the Christianity of Mr. Smith of Norwich, and of the archbishop of Canterbury, are not the same Christianity; they are consequently only what the respective owners believe to be true. The abstract Christianity, *non est inventus* in law. If the law were otherwise, men must return to burning each other as in the dark ages, for the sake of subliming abstract Christianity from the ashes. As was laid down, therefore, by Lord Winchilsea, a Mohammedan or a Jew might either of them present himself to make the declaration, 'on the true faith of a Christian,' without being understood to mean anything but those points of belief—and they are many—in which they severally agree with the inhabitants of Christian countries in general.

But if a man has a great objection to plum-porridge, there is no use in telling him that it is an excellent thing, and he may like it if he likes. Civilized men show deference to each other's tastes and fancies, even though they may not be convinced of their being reasonable and necessary. It is a base thing to take advantage of a man's honest prejudices to oppress him; even though he eschews the flesh of swine, and holds the eagle and the ossifrage in abomination among fowls. If a Jewish gentleman does not think it would be gentlemanly in himself individually, to take the declaration in Lord Winchilsea's sense,—if he thinks his conduct would be misinterpreted by his acquaintance and fellow-believers,—he ought not to be tempted to do it, and above all things he ought not to be allowed to lie under any loss or detriment from such an honourable motive. Men are fast finding out, that they meet together in society because they are men, and for human ends; and that all attempts to persuade them to injure and defraud each other in this world, for the honour and glory of the next, are the baits of

* Debate in the House of Lords on the Third Reading of the Corporation and Test Acts Repeal Bill; 28 April, 1828.—*Mir. of Parl.* Part XIII. p. 1149.

knaves to take fools,—the frauds of those of whom our fathers said,

'Your heaven you promise, but our earth you covet.'

Men of all sects are rising rapidly to an equality in general information and knowledge; and such sects as cannot resist the spread of knowledge, go out. The Jews had always an immense mine of learning, some hidden and some for every man's use. It is perfectly unreasonable to think, that the man who stands up in a University to lecture, is to be spit upon when he comes out of the pulpit. It is not because *he* will not endure it, but because *we* will not. Persecution is mistaken in its party. It throws a stone at a sheep, and hits a bull upon the nose. It is the community that is the injured; and past events have created no indisposition, to try a fall with any that may stand forth as the champions of the wrong.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 April, 1829.

ART. XIII.—*Poor Humphrey's Calendar. Wherein are given Mysterious Warnings, Plain Hints, True Tokens, Judicial Judgments, Prognostications, and Prophecies concerning the Signs of the Times; especially things to come in* 1829: *Discreetly shadowed forth to the Understanding of Listeners to the Voice of the Stars, by Remarkable Hieroglyphics with Explanations calculated to satisfy the most Unlearned Inquirers into the Secrets of Futurity. Also divers Diversions and curious Conceits for the Fair Sex and their Favourites; and many pleasant and Pithy Sayings and Thoughts in Prose and Verse.* By Poor Humphrey.—London: Published by Matilda Hone, Printseller, 29, Russell-Court, Brydges-Street, Covent Garden. And sold by all Booksellers in the United Kingdom.

HEAVEN be praised for Matilda Hone; and for the father that begat her. This is he that smote Lord Ellenborough,—some say, to the death,—standing up before his judgment-seat in the strength that was given him in that hour, and leaving an example to courtly judges which will never be forgotten while benches are made of boards. Some good men, perhaps, were wounded through misapprehension of his matter. And it is for the sake of these good men, if such there be,—and of the many bad ones to whom a delusion of any kind is daily bread,—that it is here proffered to be demonstrated, that the prosecution against Hone was founded from beginning to end upon a fallacy. *It is not true*, that the man who parodies, necessarily intends to ridicule the thing parodied, or *does* ridicule it. There are two kinds of sarcasm conveyed by parody; one, where the greater is ridiculed by being compared to the less; and the other, where the littleness of the less is made

conspicuous by being contrasted with the greater. The two kinds cannot be co-existent: for each would destroy each, and the effect be null. Now in Hone's case, no man in his senses ever doubted, that the kind was the last. When he wrote, "We praise thee, O stone; we acknowledge thee to be a bullet," everybody knew that his intention was, to ridicule a sham plot for representing a pebble thrown by some drunken artisan at a king of England's carriage, as an attempt at assassination. The judge and everybody, knew perfectly that the Liturgy was chosen for the matter of the parody, because it was *not* ridiculous;—because it was a grave and solemn object, possessing a rooted hold upon the hearers' minds, and which therefore threw into high relief the absurdity of the thing intended to be ridiculed. The judge and everybody, knew perfectly that the man was being tried for one thing with a view to punish him for another. They knew perfectly, that the desire of the court and government of those evil days, was to visit Hone with punishment for ridiculing the sham plot; and the jury stamped their knowledge on their verdict, and left it recorded for ever in the annals of baffled power and disappointed vengeance.

When a man has once been persecuted, like the son of Sirach's libertine he will never give over till he dies. It is in pursuance of this feeling that Matilda Hone, as her father's proxy, presents herself with one of the oddest attacks on the folly of our ancestors, in the shape of "Poor Humphrey's Calendar." The world has been long over-run with real fools in this department: and Humphrey comes forward in his fool's coat to whip off the puppy pack. In all that relates to the quaintness and follies of antiquity, Hone is the Cruikshank of his line. No man ever had so keen an insight into the absurdities of those we have been taught to hold for wise. Dotage and imbecility are the small game he lives upon; and he ought to be harpooned, as a very whale to antiquity. And yet he is not insensible to the beauties of antiquity either; for no man doubts the existence of its beauties,—the only quarrel is with those who would thrust its garbage down our throats for sugar-plums.

The following memoranda are worthy of nobody but Pepys.

'17 May. *Mem.*—On this day 1828, I lost the nail from the great toe of my right foot. My wife found it the next day in my left stocking.

Note. The night before, our yard-dog howled, and there was no moon.

26 May. *Mem.*—This day last year, my wife quarrelled with me, because I would not let her cut her corns while the ☽ was in ♉.

Note.—I did not speak to her for four days and three nights.'

Two special portions of the wisdom of antiquity occur in July and August.

'I find in a treatise, entitled "the Government of Cattle" set forth in 1662, by "Leonard Mascall, Chief Farrier to King James," the following stable rule, viz.

"To know the difference between a horse bewitched, and other disease, ye shall mark this; that when sick, or diseased naturally, the grief will often times alter again, by little and little, and so mend; or else it will increase by leisure, and not come so vehemently as when the animal is bewitched."

"Take a little of the herb green basil, and when dishes of meat be brought to table put the herb secretly under the dish that best pleaseth you; and as long as the herb be there, not any woman at the table shall eat of the dish that covereth the herb."

'Poor Humphrey adviseth experiment hereof when you have one dish and your appetite be good, and you like the meat, and it be scanty, and your wife seemeth hungry. It is a pleasant domestic conceit, and profitable in the success.'

December winds up with the following oracular counsel.

'Whip your Children the first thing this Morning; for so it was the Wisdom of our Ancestors to do, in commemoration of Herod's cruelty to the Innocents.—*Kind* Reader, *Farewell.*'

But better than all this, are the seven marvellous secrets from Albertus Magnus; which it would be injustice to Matilda Hone to reveal, except by the intervention of her pithy and profitable book.

The chapter "Of Uncommon Goblins" ought to be valuable to Blackwood's Magazine, or any other work that trades in keeping up the belief in that which is not. It must be grief of heart to such philosophers, to see a bull of Basan like Poor Humphrey, in the china-shop of their illusions. Could not they afford to declare he is not worth reading; by way of an advertisement for the benefit of Humphrey's mistress?

The fool hath also poetry for such as love it; as witness, in May;

'This month Mackarel comes in season;
And also reckon upon peason;
Of both these much might be uttered;
Each is very good when buttered:
Your butter should, always, be cold to your pease:
For Mackarel, melt it: but—do as you please.
Poor Humphrey is a friend to complete Toleration
And would not hurt a tender conscience by dictation.'

Nevertheless is he only tolerant in butter; for in February he is found singing the following truly Protestant lay.

'That the Pope is still a Catholic most plainly doth appear,
And we therefore hate him famously, and fearfully do fear.
For they say his troops are cruel Bulls, and that they're coming over,
And they'll run about and toss us all, unless we stop up Dover.
Now we'd let him turn a Protestant, so it's quite a shame he don't;
And it shows what a base man he is, when he might be one, and won't.'

But what if Humphrey has vaticinated? What if he has beaten all prognosticators since Nostradamus? By what strange judgment was the gift bestowed on Humphrey, as if Providence itself was in the plot to shame all lying wonders, and beat down folly by his hand? Turn to the 21st of March, on which day at nine in the morning was the duel between two noble lords*, and see if these words are not written;

'21. *Jack Saturday.*—What are you fighting about—you two?
Why—my eyes are grey, and his are blue.
Pho, pho!—you blockheads!—stand away.
Not till he changes his eyes to blue!
Not till he changes his eyes to grey!'

If Francis Moore or the Pythoness had ever made such a hit, all history would have been full of it; with no dispute but whether bright or dark agents had been the teachers†.

Many fragments of great poetical beauty are scattered through the different months; particularly some quotations from Herrick.

Reader, if thou lovest mirth better than Lord Ellenborough, give a shilling for Poor Humphrey's Calendar, that he may be fat and frolicsome another year, and shame the noodles of 1830 with most exquisite fooling.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 April, 1829.

ART. XVI.—*The Case of the Forty-Shilling Freeholders of Ireland, in a Letter to the Members of the Imperial Parliament. By the* Hon Henry R. Westenra, M.P.—London. Ridgway. 1829.

BISMI'LLAH! here beginneth the first chapter of the Book of Universal Suffrage and Annual Parliaments; which he that runs may read, and reading shall run on, till all men run

* Wellington and Winchelsea.

† Mr. Hone has subsequently informed the writer, that there was originally a second coincidence, consisting in a direction to "expect about this time" the death of a Bishop; which would have been fulfilled with all accuracy, if the printer, for some convenience of his own, had not taken it out of the month where it stood, and put it into another.—*Added in* 1839.

together, and the words of the book are ended. AL HAMDU LI'LLAH! for He is great and there is none beside. Say to the prisoners, Go forth; to them that are in darkness, Shew yourselves. They shall feed in the ways, and their pastures shall be in all high places.

Bind it as a frontlet between your eyes—let it be written on the tablet of your hearts—that because of justice and mercy were these men spoiled. When your children ask their fathers in time to come, saying, What did these things mean,—say to them, Because these men removed a sore evil they were stricken. Therefore is their seed made prosperous, and their roots spread abroad in the land.

If ministers had taken counsel together,—if a spirit had rushed upon them, to raise up the principles of free and representative government from the neglect into which they have of late times fallen,—no better course could have been devised than that in which they have been made to walk. They took an imaginative people, in the moment of their fervour and their success; and, while the wax was burning, they impressed on it a signal and a memory, that by popular representation they had carried their just cause, and that to popular representation they and all must look, both for that which they had, and that which they had not. The government held up a huge board, and chalked on it in characters of political algebra which no man could mistake,—*that security varied as the power of suffrage.* They commanded their pupils to observe, that he who had suffrage could not be oppressed, and that if he had not had it, he would have been. They shook the sleepy and flapped the careless; and called on all eyes and ears to direct themselves to the conclusion, that because the power of suffrage had removed a great wrong, *therefore it should be taken away.*

Suppose the same reasoning was carried into common life. Suppose it was determined, that it was very advantageous to the community that thieves should be arrested; but the Bow-street officer who did it, to please the thieves should be thrown into the Thames. Suppose it was settled, that fires must be got under; but the firemen who were the instruments, must be thrown into the embers *pour encourager les autres.* In either of these there would be just as much reason, as in the course proposed to be pursued towards the Irish Freeholders.

The Irish Freeholders may perhaps be easily put down. A certain number of troops and cannon will probably secure it without resistance. And what number of troops and cannon would put down the freeholders of England? The question is a just and inevitable one; because the government has

pointed out no reason why prudent men should not be providing themselves with the answer. The ministry has drawn no line of demarcation whereby any man can assure himself, that when the Irish Freeholders are on one side the boundary, his own freehold shall be found upon the other. The difference between one sum and another, is but a scratch of a pen in the blank place in a sheet of parchment. There apparently wants nothing, but that somebody should establish that his freehold has been of use to him, and it may be swept away accordingly. It is mere matter of volition, that the man in Yorkshire or in Westminster who goes to bed a freeholder, does not wake unfreeholded on the morrow. The more good his freehold does him,—the more efficacious it is found to be in keeping off the persecutor from his altar and the spoiler from his hearth,—the more likely it is that somebody should be found desirous of taking it away.

The Irish Freeholders had authenticated the splendid fact, that nature has provided for the happiness and good government of mankind, by making the influence of the rich over the poor fail just where it ought; namely, when the rich attempt to inflict on them some gross and general injustice. The assertion that the rich are in danger from the poor, is a fraud of tyranny; it is the rich who are the natural enemies of the poor, and it is on the side of the poor and not of the rich, that we are to look for nature's countervailing energies and defensive provisions. The influence of the rich is just and proper, exactly as long as it is exercised by consent. It is a bargain, like what takes place when the rich man buys the merchandise of the other. But for the rich man to complain when his influence fails, is as unjust, unreasonable, and impolitic, as if he were to complain that the poor man refused to give all the goods in his shop for a limited sum, and his wife and daughter's honour in addition. The bargain is for such things as the poor man is willing to give for the *quid pro quo;* not for such things as he is not. Hence, when the landlords complain of the tenants going against their influence,—when they peep or mutter touching the right of the rich to more servility than the poor are willing to think they pay for,—the justice and reason of their undertaking are on the same footing, as those of a demand on the part of the physical force, to take lands on their own terms, or to dictate the quantity of income which it may be allowable for a good citizen to possess. If the landlords are to be Captain Rock, the two Captain Rocks must settle it by single combat. Or if anybody else is to interfere, he must at all events deal out even-handed justice to both.

It is utterly false and without foundation, that a landlord or

proprietor of any kind has any claim to the services or votes of those below him, beyond what he can induce them voluntarily to bestow. The assertion is an insult and an enormity; and every man that hears it tamely, is a pander to his own disgrace. It would be just as true to say, the rich have a right to the goods in the market, beyond what their money will buy. Their good luck has given them the power in one way; but it does not therefore follow, that they have it in the other too. They have a right to all their money will procure them; but they have not a right to what other people possess, whether they chuse to part with it or not. The pretence set up in Ireland to an abstract right over the votes of the tenants, is undiluted slavery,—the custom of the West Indies transferred to Clare. It is pure unmingled feudalism; such as men thought the world, in this part at least, had thrown off for centuries. It has raised the question, and thrust it home to every poor man's heart in every parish and hundred in Great Britain,—whether the poor have any rights,—whether they are an entity in the eye of law or not,—whether they are anything but machines to work the rich man's will, to drain his bogs, to hoard his game, and vote at his elections. Time was, when if they did these things, it was supposed to be because they were paid for it; but the new doctrine is, that these are claims of right, and that the tenant came into the world the landlord's voter and his slave.

However remote men may be from the general knowledge of the truth, the first step towards improvement is that *somebody* should know it. The abstract verity is, that nobody should steal; however far the annals of Bow-street may prove us from the practice. No man has disproved—no man will ever disprove—that the right of suffrage is as universal and clear a claim, as the right of purchasing in the market. Fallacies may be multiplied in opposition, till they amount to as many as there are days in the year, or in all the years since Adam; but they all drop off when dry,—*non haerent vestibus*, —they require but a shake to cast them from the garment they dishonour. How fast, or by what steps, men may advance towards the practical application of the truth, is a distinct question; but the first thing is, that the truth be known. And the great truth,—of which vast regions, foremost of the world in posession of all real good, are marching in the hourly demonstration,—is, that when all have suffrage and not before, the political interests of all are fitly framed together into a harmonious whole, in the same manner that their pecuniary interests are, by allowing every man's money in the market to tell for what it has the power to count. Property should be represented; but then it should be property in the hands of

everybody, and this can only take place when everybody is represented. The fallacy put forward is, that the rich should have the benefit of their property, and have a monopoly of the representation besides; which is exactly as wise and just, as if they claimed to have the benefit of their money in the market, but urged that they could not have this unless they kept the poor man out.

Why the ministry chose the present hour for fixing the world's attention on this magnificent truth, is best known to themselves. It was not necessity; it must therefore have been good-will. With all the intelligence and suffering of the country at their backs, the ways were not one but many, in which ten brief words would have tamed the most rampant opposition, and moulded it to their hand. Why, for example, should the minister have done such a thing,—when he could have dug a hole and whispered 'Corn-laws,' and every rural Midas must have danced attendance in his train. 'The fox,' saith an ancient historian, 'when he is troubled with fleas in his skin as his custom is, he entereth the water, and holdeth a good piece of wool in his mouth, and when by little and little he is covered, and the fleas have entered the wool, he letteth it go, and so is delivered.' What if the minister should imitate this specimen of quadrupedal intelligence, and when the armies of the intolerants have collected themselves into the Disfranchisement bill, should drop the whole together, and send them floating down the stream of public ridicule? The man that can win a battle, can do as much; and it would be pure gain to the cause of public freedom, because the impression in favour of the powers of suffrage would be more strong than ever.

Unless some turn like this prevents it, there is the greatest probability that the unjust disfranchisement will be carried almost by acclamation. There is no use in trying to resist what cannot be resisted; the business of wise men is to collect what may be of future use, like the officers who on their retreat from Moscow speculated on the crystallization of flakes of snow. The grand experimental inference—whose roots are here and its branches with posterity—has been insisted on already. The next is, to remember that henceforth for ever, when some bloated abuse shrieks under the axe of a just majority,—when it cries for mercy in the grasp of the finisher of the law, and stammers out the words "vested interests" in its terror,—no answer but one arise from the assembled crowds,—"The Forty-Shilling Freeholders!" *Ye* gave no mercy; why should ye have any? When the question was of the vested rights of two hundred thousand men, given solemnly by ancient

compact, and exercised for the noblest purposes that any compact could have in view,—these were as straw and stubble before your ardour to destroy; and why should the people's friends, in the hour of their strength and triumph, regard *your* antiquity of injustice and precedents of wrong. Twelve little months, and who would have thought of seeing the Protestant monopoly expiring in the arms of a minority. A twelvemonth more may see the universal British people at issue with some other form of selfishness;—and then should their souls be moved by the wailings of the "vested interests," should their eyes be disposed to pity and their hands to spare,—the memory of the Forty-Shilling Freeholders shall be put in, like the belt of the slain upon the fallen hero of the Æneid, and change all soft relenting weakness into one stern cry for justice and dispatch. What might otherwise have been vengeance, forewarned is retribution. There are strong links between an injury and its punishment, which man may slight, but the Providence which rules the world has promised to remember. See if its hand be shortened—if it forget this once, to leave a lesson for the benefit of those who shall come after us for ever.

The stand made for the Forty-Shilling Freeholders by the member for the county of Monaghan, is in itself a proof of the advantage of the system it is intended to destroy. When Ireland had sunk into a concealed civil war between the many and the few, the existence of the Forty-Shilling Freeholders could bring forward able defenders of the poor man's rights, and amalgamate the feelings of the noble with the injuries of the peasant. Go to, now; and destroy all this. Tell the peasant he shall stand on one side of the ditch, and the constitution on the other; but wonder not if he be seen breast-high upon his passage, and if the next news of him be upon the crown of your defence.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 July, 1829.

ART. I.—1. *Three Lectures on the Mercantile Theory of Wealth, delivered before the University of Oxford.* By Nassau William Senior, late Fellow of Magdalen College, A. M., Professor of Political Economy.—London. Murray. 1828.

2. *Two Lectures on Population, delivered before the University of Oxford, in Easter Term,* 1828. By Nassau William Senior, A. M., Professor of Political Economy. *To which is added, a Correspondence between the Author and the Rev. T. R. Malthus.* —London. Saunders and Otley, Conduit Street. 1829.

3. *Mathematical Exposition of some Doctrines of Political Economy. From the Transactions of the Cambridge Philosophical Society.*

By W. Whewell, M. A. F. R. S., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Professor of Mineralogy in the University of Cambridge, and Fellow of the Cambridge Philosophical Society.—Cambridge. Printed by J. Smith, Printer to the University. 1829.

Catechism on the Corn Laws; with a list of Fallacies and the Answers. By a Member of the University of Cambridge. Sixth Edition.—London. Published for the Proprietors of the Westminster Review, by J. C. Stephens, 4, York Street, Covent Garden; and by Cowie and Strange, 64, Paternoster Row. 1829.

'*GLORY to God and the Empress! Ismaïl has fallen.*' Such, with distinction due between the Giver and the instruments, may be the exclamation of a mightier than Suwarrow, on a greater victory* than was ever won by barbarian or slave. Religious despotism is virtually destroyed; it fell the hour it was acknowledged in parliament, that others besides the predominant sect, have a right to be heard for justice. From that hour the path was clear and open to the discovery, that all religious sects—down to Joanna Southcote's inclusive, if it still exist—have a claim to a fair dividend of the funds appropriated by law to the maintenance of religious teachers. That such a discovery must come, is as clear as that the claim to the equal distribution of justice will be discovered in any other branches of the administration. The only reasonable plea in opposition would have been, if what is called the Established Church could have urged, that the gifts had been made to her by the original owners. But it happens that she herself is only a tenant by club law. Any will or intent of the original owners, is as completely set at naught by every hour of her occupation, as if the possession were in the hands of the followers of Joanna Southcote; and, to increase the difficulty, the representatives of the original owners are among the foremost claimants for a fair division. The only hold therefore of the predominant sect is in the *fiat* of the legislature; and as the legislators become more impartial and enlightened, an approximation must necessarily be accomplished to what is in accordance with justice to the whole.

These are among the further movements which everybody sees must be consequent on the fall of the fortress which has just been carried. But there are other *Ismaïls* of nearer site, which must be attacked long before arriving at these ultimate results. Religious equality will come in time; but in the mean while, we must have the bread that perishes. And as all wrongs hang in a certain degree by one another, the moment when a great blow has been struck in favour of justice in Ire-

* Emancipation of the Catholics, received the Royal Assent 13 April, 1829.—*Added in* 1839.

land, is evidently favourable for an effort on the part of the people of England to procure their emancipation from an equally flagrant injury at home.

The Corn Laws are no new subject; and for that very reason, have a chance for continuing six months longer than might otherwise have been the natural term of their existence. They may be defined to be, the prohibition of foreign trade by act of parliament, for the benefit of the owners of land, who by means of the imperfect state of the representation, have contrived to acquire a majority of votes in the House of Commons. It is true that foreign commerce is not prohibited in the abstract. As in Figaro's celebrated dissertation on the liberty of the press, there is perfect liberty in everything that is of no use. The only restriction put on the manufacturer and merchant is, that their goods shall not be sold for the only thing that is wanted in return. It is permitted to them to buy sticking-plaister *ad libitum:* but if they aspire to the more substantial consolation of food, the land-owner steps in, and declares it to be a breach of his patent. How, or for what reason, the manufacturer thus comes into the world bridled and saddled, and the land-owner ready booted and spurred to mount,—how or why it should be more expedient and just that the land-owner should have a prohibition or duty against corn being procured by the operations of the manufacturer, than that the manufacturer should have a prohibition or duty against the growth of corn at home, for the sake of increasing what he would purchase from abroad,—is what nobody has explained, except by pointing to the inequality of the representation, and the well-known disposition of mankind to use power for their own advantage when they have it. On these grounds indeed, the situation of the manufacturing interest is as explicable as the situation of the negro interest in the West Indies. It is a simple display of power against justice; and the evil must go on till somebody or other can be persuaded that it would be wise to alter it.

A remarkable circumstance connected with the supporters of the injustice is, that they never venture on a reply. They can put off and vend a string of original fallacies; but when these are answered and exploded, no invitation can induce them to enter on the pain and peril of rejoinder. The fact before the public therefore is, that their defence is at a stand. They are not men that can render a reason. Like unskilful pugilists, they throw their arms abroad, and may chance to hit an opponent who has no notion of defence; but one parry, and they are down,—they have no idea of a *riposte*. It is plain therefore, that as Marlborough said, 'they must go off.'

They may kill some thousands in the going; but go they must. The public will never submit to be oppressed, by people who cannot say a word in their defence. A certain quantity of good tropes are necessary ammunition for every wrong; and when the stock of these is out, the end of the mischief is at hand. Why—as has been often said before—does not Vindex or Agricola write down the babblers on the Corn Laws? Why does not the Quarterly Review, for instance, confound the "demagogues who describe our land-owners as drones subsisting upon the earnings of the people"—or Blackwood turn some of his hundred arms of might, to protect the unfortunate sufferers from the aspersions of their enemies? The reason is clear; it is because they cannot. In all causes, one side must win; and the last fatal symptom for the losing party is, when his advocates are conscious that the less is said the better. In all of which, there is no desire to triumph, or to institute invidious comparisons with anybody; but only to take political advantage, to the greatest possible extent, of the substantial fact.

When the press on the side of the monopolists is in this unresisting state, it would be weakness to suppose there could be any doubt of the ultimate result, however great the material force arranged upon the other side. No cause can hold its ground, after it has given up its defence by argument. It is true that it may be a long time before argument finds its way into the necessary places. But this is no more than an inevitable consequence of the structure of a representative government like ours. Knowledge, like everything else, must take root downwards and bear fruit upwards; and it would be a most odd and unreasonable demand, that should expect the representative to find wisdom for the represented. The people must first be wise, that they may chuse representatives of like quality. When every man, and woman, and grown child, in the lower and middle ranks of society, have been for twelve months conversant with all the mystery of Corn Laws, it will be quite time enough to expect any appearance of substantial transfusion into the councils of their representatives.

As soon, however, as any such transfusion shall take place, strong hopes may be indulged, from the rapidity with which representatives are known to be illuminated, on points where a great mass of public opinion is brought to bear. They are subject, above all men, to what Newton called 'fits of easy transmission and reflection;' and the Catholic question is a case at hand, to demonstrate how easily a cause that six months before appeared to be in a state of hopeless obscuration, may find itself the subject of extensive comprehension and support.

There is no guarantee against the effect of common sense upon a minister. Masses of men may agree to keep it out, and by mutual cheers may keep up their spirits to the sticking point. But there is no providing against the secret voice, which haunts the leader of a nation's counsels, crying to him 'Good Launcelot—or good Gobbo—or good Launcelot Gobbo—consult the public interest *and your own*, however disagreeable it may be to gentlemen opposed to you.'

The point which the opposition to the Corn Laws has at present reached, is that of being acknowledged by Professors of both the Universities. If any man can tell what interval there was between the publication of the Newtonian system and its acknowledgment in parliament, he will have a valuable datum for calculating the present prospects of the country. First stands forth the Professor of Political Economy in the wild and revolutionary University of Oxford; who publishes his lectures annually by statute, "that the public may know the sort of doctrines inculcated" among that learned body. And truly most comfortable it must be to the squirearchy of these realms, to find that their babes and sucklings are fed with downright doctrines of free trade, in the very metropolis and head-quarters of aristocratic lore;—and this not drily or repulsively, but after such an attractive and convincing manner, as may chance to stay by the disciple for the remainder of his life, and make him a most unworthy successor to the immunities of his forefathers.

Though the Corn Laws are not prominently brought forward by name in the Oxford lectures, like the statue of Brutus they are brought to every man's recollection by their absence. When the folly of the protective system generally, is displayed in clear and engaging language, there is no necessity for writing underneath, 'This means the Corn-laws.' It may truly be said of these enactments, that he that is not for them is against them; and every man that enters on the field of political economy, must either encounter the risk of entering decidedly on their defence, or run into a tacit exposition of their injustice and enormity.

Professor Whewell's work is a mathematical exposition of Adam Smith's theory of rent, and of its various workings and exemplifications under the circumstances which in practice are liable to occur. It is therefore virtually an exposition of the principles of opposition to the Corn Laws. In this view it makes an æra in their history. From this period, the opposition to them may be considered as placed on the basis of mathematical reasoning, and as presenting the same broad challenge to examination and assent, that is offered in other applications of

the same science. The monopolists will of course laugh in their high places, at the idea of being beaten out of their monopoly by algebra. But other men know, that it is an awful thing to have the algebraists in opposition, and that *plus* and *minus* settle all races in the end.

Last of all comes the everlasting 'Catechism;' of which, as being in some sort a poor thing of their own, it becomes the concerned to speak only in the way of assisting the diffusion of its contents. It has wrought itself up to the notice of as many fallacies as there are days in the year; and by having all the additions distinguished from the rest, it presents as fair a mark for renewed observation and extract, as an additional volume or a supplementary book. The most important parts of the additions, are those which relate to the proof that the operation of Corn Laws is to reduce the money prices both of agricultural and manufactured produce, *the last most;* and the deduction of the way in which the misery of the agricultural labourers, as well as of the manufacturers, is the result of the Corn Laws. When the numbers of the manufacturing population begin to press against the limits of the food which can be furnished by the monopolists, the manufacturers will consent to give an increased quantity of goods for a given sum, (as for instance for a guinea), as the means of purchasing corn; and hence the money price of goods will fall. But the number of guineas which will be given for a quantity of corn, depends on the number necessary to make the consumers agree upon the mode in which the stock in hand shall be divided among them. Since, therefore, guineas cost more labour to the consumers or to a great and effective portion of them, than they did before, a smaller number will make them agree on the division; and hence the money price of corn will fall too. A further consequence of which will clearly be, that a portion of guineas will go out of circulation by being restored to the uses of common life, on the ordinary principles of currency. So that after all the rout that has been made on the danger of a free trade in corn diminishing the gold in circulation, this effect is in reality the produce of the Corn Laws. This explodes the fallacy on which the agriculturists have dwelt with considerable effect, and which in truth was one of the very small number of good ones they had upon their side,—that as corn has fallen, the distresses of the manufacturers have gone on increasing. It is quite true that corn has fallen. For example, between 1814 and 1826, it fell from 72*s.* to 57*s.*; which is twenty-one per cent. But the wages of a weaver for weaving a given quantity of cambrics, fell in the same time from 13*s.* to 2*s.* 9*d.*; which is *seventy-nine* per cent. If the wages of the weaver had fallen

in the same proportion as the price of corn, they would have only fallen to 10*s.* 3½*d.*; but instead of that, they have fallen to 2*s.* 9*d.*, which is not much more than a fourth of the other. The agricultural monopolists therefore, get the labour of the weaver for a little more than one-fourth of the substantial price they paid before;—which is the mystery of the Corn Laws, and what they of course intend to stand out for as long as they are able. Of this general fall of prices, some part may have been caused by the return to gold payments; but gold payments did not cause the wages of the weaver to fall four times more than the price of corn.

The other point may as well be stated in the words of the book.

'There must always be a balance between the conditions of the agricultural and the manufacturing labourers; because if any striking difference arises between them, there will be a transfer from one class to the other. It may not take place among the grown labourers; but it will take place among their children, which comes to the same thing in the end. There may not be a migration, either of grown persons or of children, from Sussex into Yorkshire, or *vice versâ*; but there will be a migration from one neighbouring county into another,—and from the next county into that,—and so on till it reaches from Yorkshire to Sussex at the last. Hence if the manufacturing labourers are reduced to misery by the Corn Laws, the agricultural ones must needs go shares.

'The same reasoning will prove, that the farmers have no substantial interest in the preservation of the monopoly. It is true, that in the first instance, they have an interest; of the same kind as would the shopmen of a race of shopkeepers, who had the power to exclude the rest. But if they have no outlet for their children in the advancing industry of the community, they must starve one another, and be a most beggarly race in the end. And the same conclusion will be applicable to many classes of the land-owners. It will be applicable in fact to all, except those who can quarter their children on the public for support.'—p. 27.

'The misery of the mass of the population in countries which produce nothing but corn, is easily accounted for. They have no source of demand upon the owners of the soil, except for their agricultural labour; and in this, their habits and numbers are such as to reduce their recompense to the lowest possible scale. The reason, therefore, why the Irish peasantry starve on potatoes in the midst of corn and beef, is the same that makes the negro in the West Indies drink water, in the midst of all the materials for punch. There is no existing cause why the master should give him punch. And if the exportation of sugar and rum was prohibited, it does not follow that the negro would get any more punch.'—p. 24.

Two new fallacies with the answers, of some importance

in the existing state of the question, are among the latest alterations.

'That the Corn Laws are at the present moment inoperative; because prices are such that the actual duty is nothing or inconsiderable.

A. 'The Corn Laws act, not only by what they do, but by what they are ready to do.. It might as well be urged that the sentries at St. Helena were inoperative, because they did not fire upon Napoleon. They only stood ready to fire, if he attempted to escape.

'The Corn Laws enact, that corn shall never be cheap to the manufacturer, though it may be as dear as it pleases. They stand by to fire upon the foreign grower, if he presumes to grow corn for the English market. The way to try the justice of the plea, is to suppose that the manufacturers had got a scale of duties on home-grown corn, being nothing when corn was 5*s.* a quarter, and that when corn was at 5*s.* the agriculturists were told it was the act of heaven, and the duties had nothing to do with the result.'—p. 36.

'That corn will be got so cheap from Ireland, that the Corn Laws will be a dead letter in respect of foreign corn, which will be no longer wanted.

A. 'If Ireland for a time produces an influx of cheap corn, wise men should seize the opportunity to get rid of the Corn Laws, while there is less of immediate interest concerned in their support. There is no use in leaving a highwayman at large, because he will not rob till the long nights come back.'—p. 26.

So long as the necessities of the state can be supplied without any remarkable alteration in the present mode of collection, the Corn Laws may have a chance to stand. But the first necessity for any change, will probably bring them in ruins upon the heads of the monopolists. For instance, the first proposal of a Property-tax—which is a thing already whispered as possible—would set all who have property, on the discovery, that the Property-tax was only a subscription to maintain the landlords in an unjust gain. It is in fact totally incredible, that any nation would acquiesce in the imposition of a Property-tax, when the whole necessity and demand for such an infliction arose out of the determination of the dominant party to lay restraints upon the industry of the community. Any hesitation or difficulty in paying the fund-holders would, in like manner, rouse all the fund-holders to the consciousness, that the danger to them rose entirely out of the law which determines, that the resources of the United Empire shall be limited to what can be supported on two bushels of corn where there might have been four. And in aid of either or both of these, would be added the united feeling of all ranks and orders of society—except the monopolists,—that in their several places and degrees, they were cut down and defrauded of their fair propor-

tions, in the same manner as would take place if the landlords of the Isle of Wight had the power to confine the country to the corn grown on their particular estates. Such an abuse might have done for the dark ages,—it might have had some chance of being tolerated in the days of spiritual and temporal villeinage,—but in a nation that has abolished the slave trade and broken down religious tests, it is incomparably too gross and shocking to hold out any chance of permanent possession of the wrong. The opponents of the Corn Laws may not at this moment be very strong in parliament; but they have a powerful defensive position, which they will know how to use when the time comes. If they cannot make the occasion, they will wait till the occasion comes to *them*. The other side are in a cleft stick; they cannot go on long as they are, and they cannot stir into any new path without demolishing the Corn Laws.

To wind up all, comes the tremendous danger of a minister's having the tact to discover, how much his own interests are depressed by a plan for keeping down the country to the standard of the landlords. Debt, poor-laws, deficient revenue, press on the minister on every side; and he is to lie in this Castle of Despair, without discovering that he has "the key called Promise in his pocket" whenever he chuses to take the open road. A commander of a patrole would be broken who should commit a similar *niaiserie;* and there is no reason why the emancipator of Ireland should be charged in such a sort, till at least there has been time to try.

The end and upshot is to know how the evil is ever to be removed. And here it is plain, that it will not be done by blinking any part of the mischief, or surrendering any portion of the justice of the case. There must be no acknowledgment of the right of the landlords to a little wrong; but an open claim on the part of the commercial and manufacturing interest, to compensation for fifteen years' damages. Where the object is to remove, it is useless to distract attention by demanding any previous alteration in the form of the evil. The injustice is at this moment an injustice of scales and degrees; and it will be enough if, in this state, it can be sent into its grave. At the present instant, the well-informed part of the manufacturing population would probably be content to see the evil in a state of reduction by a shilling a year on each of the degrees of the existing scale. But as the force of public opinion increases, they will of course raise their terms, like the bearer of the Sibylline books; and finally take as rapid a draught of justice and retribution, as their position shall enable them to command.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 July, 1829.

ART. XV.—*A Prospectus of the Quipola, or an Explanation of the Quipoes, now open for Public Opinion.*—London. Printed by J. Phair, 69, Great Peter Street, Westminster. 1827. 4to. pp. 18.

'THE *Quipos*, or knots on cords of different colours, which are 'celebrated by authors fond of the marvellous, as if they had 'been regular annals of the [Peruvian] empire, imperfectly supplied 'the place of writing. According to the obscure description of them 'by Acosta, which Garcilasso de la Vega has adopted with little 'variation and no improvement, the quipos seem to have been a 'device for rendering calculation more expeditious and accurate. By 'the various colours different objects were denoted, and by each knot 'a distinct number. Thus an account was taken, and a kind of 'register kept, of the inhabitants in each province, or of the several 'productions collected there for public use. But as by these knots, 'however varied or combined, no moral or abstract idea, no operation 'or quality of the mind could be represented, they contributed little 'towards preserving the memory of ancient events and institutions. 'By the Mexican paintings and symbols, rude as they were, more 'knowledge of remote transactions seems to have been conveyed, than 'the Peruvians could derive from their boasted quipos. Had the 'latter been even of more extensive use, and better adapted to supply 'the place of written records, they perished so generally, together 'with other monuments of Peruvian ingenuity, in the wreck occa- 'sioned by the Spanish conquest, and the civil wars subsequent to it. 'that no accession of light or knowledge comes from them.'—*Robertson's History of America.* BOOK vii.

It is difficult to say how a writer of ordinary caution can have fallen into a statement so much at variance with the authorities from which it professes to be derived. It is clear from the accounts of the original historians, that the quipos were not only 'adapted to supply the place of written records,' but that they *were* records. Since the subject involves a reference to transactions of singular curiosity, as being without parallel in any other portion of the history of mankind, occasion will be taken by the appearance of what professes to be a genuine set of Peruvian quipos, to bring forward the proofs. What may be the authenticity of the specimen produced, or the value of the matter it professes to record, is a separate question. Even if it is nothing, it does not remove the interest that attaches to the contemplation of a new exertion of human intellect, in remote regions and an unknown age. If Cadmus is in Elysium, the inventor of knot-writing must have some place of honour in the land of souls; and if spirits in that dreamy country are capable of satisfaction from what passes in this grosser world, some feather-cinctured sage may be rejoicing in the chain of accidents which at this distant period brings his creations once more before the thoughts of living men.

First hear Acosta, in the quaint dress bestowed on him by Purchas.

'Besides this diligence [in observing Traditions], they supplied the want of Letters and Writings partly by painting, as those of *Mexico* (although they of *Peru* were very grosse and blockish), and partly, and most commonly by *Quippos*. These *Quippos* are Memorials or Registers: made of Bowes [*hechos de ramales**], in the which there are diuers knots and colours, which doe signifie diuers things, and it is strange to see what they haue expressed and represented by this meanes: for their *Quippos* serue them insteed of *Bookes of Histories, of Lawes, Ceremonies, and accounts of their affaires.* There were officers appointed to keep these *Quippos*, the which at this day they call *Quipocamayos*, the which were bound to giue an account of euery thing, as *Notaries and Registers* doe heere. Therefore they fully beleeued them in all things, for according to the varietie of businesse, as Warres, Policies, Tributes, Ceremonies, and Lands, there were sundry *Quippos* or branches [*ramales**], in euery one of the which there were so many knots little and great, and strings tyed vnto them, some Red, some Greene, some Blue, some White, and finally, such diuersitie, that euen as wee deriue an infinite number of words from the foure and twentie Letters, applying them in diuers sorts, so doe they draw innumerable words from their knots, and diuersitie of colours.'—*Purchas his Pilgrimes. Part III, p.* 1053. *Translated from* Historia Natural y Moral de las Indias. Por el Padre Ioseph de Acosta. A. D. 1608. *L. 6. p.* 410.

This is neither an obscure description, nor a description of a device for rendering calculation more expeditious and accurate. Next listen to the "Ynca Garcilasso de la Vega, Captain in the service of his Majesty, &c.;" whose account, as containing a report of the most extraordinary act of diplomacy ever committed by any of Heaven's creatures, is worth presenting in the original words. It is, however, but fair to add that the Ynca Garcilasso frequently contradicts the current of his own history, by what he is pleased to deliver as his formal summary; and he does so in the present instance. But the truth ought to have been sifted by further examination†.

---

* "*Ramales*" does not mean "boughs" or "branches," but "strings." Ramal, *Funiculus.* LARRAMENDI.—1839.

† When Hernando Pizarro and Hernando de Soto had the first audience of the Inca,

Con la gente y cortesanos que en la sala acompañauan al Inca, estauan dos contadores é historiadores que asentaron en sus historias añales por sus ñudos, señales, y cifras, como mejor pudieron, la embaxada de Hernando de Soto

'With the people and courtiers that accompanied the Inca in the hall of audience, were two story-tellers or historiographers, who set down in their historical annals by means of their knots, marks, and cyphers, in the best way they were able, the contents of the embassy of Hernando de

It is undeniably very pleasant to be certain. It would be desirable to have no *lacunae* in the evidence, and to possess a

---

(aunque mal declarada) y la respuesta del Inca.— *Historia General del Peru; escrita por el Ynca Garcilasso de la Vega, Capitan de su magestad, &c. Cordoua.* 1617. *Parte II. C.* 20.

Soto (although badly delivered by the interpreter), *and the answer of the Inca.*'

This embassy was in due time followed by another; which introduces a new character into the scene.

Entonces llegó al Inca un religioso Dominico llamado Fray Vicente de Valuerde, con vna cruz en la mano á hablarle de parte del Emperador.

El Inca se admiró grandemente de ver la forma del frayle Dominico, de la barua y corona rayda, como la traen los religiosos, y del habito largo, y de la cruz de Palma; que en las manos lleuaua y vn libro, que era la suma de Siluestre, otros dizen que era el Breuiario, otros que la Biulia; tome cada vno lo que mas le agradare. El Rey, para saber como auia de tratar aquel hombre, preguntó á vno de tres Indios principales, que por su mandado, los quatro dias antes, auian hecho dar todo lo necesario á los Españoles, y le dixo, este Español de que calidad y condicion es? por ventura es superior á los demas, ó inferior á ellos, ó es vgual con todos? El Indio respondio, no pude saber otra cosa, Inca, mas de que este es capitan, y guia de palabra, (quiso dezir predicador) y ministro del Dios supremo Pachacamac, y mensajero suyo: los demas no son como el. Entonces llegó el Padre fray Vicente, y auiendole hecho reuerencia, y veneracion conforme al vso de los religiosos; y con licencia del Rey le hizo la oracion siguiente.

'Then there advanced to the Inca a Dominican monk, named Friar Vicente de Valverde, with a cross in his hand, to address him on the part of the Emperor Charles the Fifth.'

'The Inca marvelled much to see the figure of the Dominican friar, with his beard and shaven crown, as monks have, and his long dress and cross of palm-tree that he carried in his hands, and a book which was the Summary of St. Silvester, or as some say the Breviary, and others the Bible so everybody may chuse which he likes best. The king, to know how he was to behave to such a person, asked one of the three principal Indians who by his command had four days before directed the furnishing the Spaniards with all that was necessary for them, and said to him, "What condition is this Spaniard of? May he chance to be the superior of those others, or their inferior, or are they all alike?' The Indian replied, "I can tell no more, Inca, than that he is a great officer, and *Director of Talk* (he meant to say *Preacher*), and the minister of the supreme God Pachacamac, and his messenger; the rest are not like *him*." Then the Father Friar Vicente advanced, and after making a reverence and act of humiliation conformably to the usage of the monks, with permission from the king he made the following oration.

Conviene que sepas fa-

"It is fit you should know, most famous and

set of Quipos authenticated by the mark of the Peruvian who composed them, and witnessed by a number of respectable

mosissimo y poderosissimo rey como es necessario, que á vuestra alteza, y á todos vuestros vassallos se les enseñe, no solamente la verdadera Fé Catholica; mas tambien que oygas y creas las que se siguen.

Primeramente que Dios trino y vno crió el Cielo y la tierra, y todas las cosas que ay en el mundo. El qual dá los premios dela vida eterna á los buenos, y castiga á los malos con pèna perpetua. Este Dios al principio del mundo crió al hombre del polvo dela tierra, y le dió espiritu de vida, que nosotros llamamos anima; la qual hizo Dios á su imagen y semejança. Por lo qual todo hombre consta de cuerpo y anima racional.

Deste primer hombre aquien Dios llamó Adan, descendemos todos los hombres que ay en èl mundo, y del tomamos el principio y origen de nuestra naturaleza. Este hombre Adan pecó quebrantando el mandamiento de su criador, y en el pecaron todos los hombres que hasta oy han nacido, y los que naceran hasta la fin del mundo: ningun hombre ni muger ay libre desta mancha, ni lo abra, sacando á nuestro señor Iesu Christo. El qual siendo hijo de Dios verdadero, descendio delos cielos, y nascio de la Virgen Maria, para redimir y librar de la sujecion del pecado á todo el genero humano, finalmente murio por nuestra salud en vna Cruz de palo semejante á esta, que tengo en las manos; por lo qual los que somos Christianos la adoramos y reuerenciamos.

Este Iesu Christo por su propria virtud resuscitó de entre los muertos, y á

most powerful king, how needful it is that Your Highness and all your subjects should not only be taught the true Catholic faith, but also hear and believe the things which follow."

"First, that God, trine and one, created the heaven and the earth, and all the things that are in the world. Who moreover gives the rewards of eternal life to the good, and chastises the wicked with perpetual punishment. This God at the beginning of the world created man of the dust of the earth, and gave him a spirit of life, which we call soul; the which, God made after his own image and likeness. From whence it follows that every man consists of body and rational soul."

"From this first man whom God called Adam, we all of us descend who are in the world, and take from him the principle and origin of our nature. This man Adam sinned by breaking the commandment of his creator, and in him sinned all the men who have been born to this day, and those who shall be born to the end of the world; there is neither man nor woman free from this stain, nor ever will be, saving our Lord Jesus Christ. Who being truly son of God, came down from the heavens' and was born of the Virgin Mary, to redeem and free from subjection to sin the whole human race, and at last died for our salvation on a cross of wood like what I hold in my hands; which is the reason that we who are Christians adore and reverence it."

"This Jesus Christ by his own proper power rose again from the dead, and after forty days went

householders his contemporaries. But as there is no hope of this at present, it remains only to examine such specimens

los quarenta dias subio á los cielos, y está assentado á la diestra de Dios Padre todo poderoso. Dexó en la tierra á sus Apostoles, y á los sucessores dellos, para que con palabras y amonestaciones, y otros caminos muy santos atraxessen á los hombres al conoscimiento y culto de Dios; y á la guarda de su ley.

Quiso tambien, que san Pedro su Apostol fuesse principe, assi delos demas Apostoles y de los sucessores dellos, como de todos los demas Christianos; y vicario de Dios; y que despues de el, todos los Pontifices Romanos sucessores de san Pedro (á los quales los Christianos llamamos Papas) tuuiessen la misma suprema autoridad que Dios le dió. Los quales todos entonces, y aora, y siempre tuuieron y tienen cuydado de exercitarse con mucha santidad en predicar, y enseñar á los hombres la palabra de Dios.

Por tanto el Papa Romano Pontifice, que oy viue en la tierra, entendiendo que todas las gentes y naciones destos reynos, dexando á vn Dios verdadero hazedor de todos ellos, adoran torpisimamente los Idolos, y semejanças del demonio: Queriendo traerlas al verdadero conoscimiento de Dios; concedio la conquista destas partes á Carlos quinto Emperador de los Romanos, Rey poderosissimo de las Españas, y Monarca de toda la tierra; para que auiendo sujetado estas gentes, y á sus Reyes y señores, y auiendo echado de entre ellos los rebeldes y pertinazes, reyne el solo

up into the heavens, and is now sitting at the right hand of God the Father Almighty. And he left in the earth his Apostles, and the successors of the same, that with words and admonitions and other most holy methods they should bring mankind to the knowledge and worship of God, and to the observation of his law."

"He moreover thought fit that St. Peter his Apostle should be chief both of the rest of the Apostles and their successors and of all other Christians, and vicar of God; and that after him all the Roman Pontiffs successors of St. Peter (whom we Christians call Popes) should have the same supreme authority which God gave to him. The whole of whom, then, now, and ever, have applied and do apply to the exercising of themselves with all holiness in preaching and teaching to mankind the word of God."

"Wherefore the Pope the Roman Pontiff at this present living upon earth, hearing that all the peoples and nations of these kingdoms, forsaking the worship of one true God the maker of them all, most stupidly adore idols and likenesses of the devil; desiring to bring them to the true knowledge of God, did grant the right of conquering these countries to Charles the Fifth, Emperor of the Romans, most powerful Sovereign of the two Spains, and Monarch of all the earth, with intent that after having subjected these peoples, and their kings and lords, and driven from among them the rebellious and obstinate, he do reign sole, and rule and govern the said nations, and bring them to the knowledge of God and the obedience of the Church. And our most powerful king, albeit much

as happen to be offered. It would be unwise to reject what may be known partially, because it cannot at present be known

y rixa y gouierne estas naciones, y las trayga al conoscimiento de Dios, y á la obediencia de la Yglesia. Nuestro poderosissimo Rey aunque estaua muy bien ocupado, ó impedido en el gouierno de sus grandes Reynos y prouincias, admitio la concession del Papa, y no la rehusó por la salud de estas gentes, y embió sus capitanes y soldados á la execucion della. como lo hizo para conquistar las grandes Islas, y las tierras de Mexico sus vezinas: y auiendo las sujetado con sus armas y potencia las han reduzido á la verdadera religion de Iesu Christo: porque esse mismo Dios dixo, que los compeliessen á entrar.

Por lo qual el gran Emperador Carlos Quinto elligio por su lugar teniente y embaxador á don Francisco Piçarro (que está aqui) para que tambien estos reynos de vuestra Alteza reciban el mismo beneficio, y para assentar confederacion y aliença de perpetua amistad entre su Magestad y vuestra alteza: de manera que vuestra Alteza y todo su reyno le sea tributario, este es, que pagando tributo al Emperador seas su subdito y de todo punto le entregues el reyno, y renuncies la administracion y gouierno del, assi como lo han hecho otros Reyes, y señores. Esto es lo primero, lo segundo es, que hecha esta paz y amistad, y auiendote sujetado de grado ó por fuerça, has de dar verdadera obediencia al Papa Sumo pontifice, y recebir y creer la Fé de Iesu Christo nuestro Dios, y menos preciar y echar de ti totalmente la abominable supersticion de los idolos,

occupied or engaged in the government of his extensive kingdoms and provinces, has admitted the grant of the Pope, and for the sake of the salvation of the said nations has been unwilling to decline it; and has sent his captains and soldiers for the execution of the same, as he did for the conquest of the great Islands, and the countries of Mexico in their neighbourhood; who, having subjected them by their arms and power, have reduced them to the true religion of Jesus Christ; for as much as the same God hath said, that they should 'compel them to come in.'"

27637

"Whereupon the great Emperor Charles the Fifth has chosen for his Lieutenant and Ambassador Don Francisco Pizarro here present, with intent as well that these kingdoms of Your Highness should receive the same benefit, as to conclude a confederation and alliance of perpetual amity between His Majesty and Your Highness; in such sort that Your Highness and all your kingdom shall be tributary to him, to wit, that paying a tribute to the Emperor you shall be his subject, and shall in all and every point make over to him the kingdom, and renounce the administration and government thereof, as has been done by other Kings and lords. And thereafter, Secondly. That after making such peace and amity, and after having submitted yourself either by voluntary consent or through the force of arms, you are to pay true obedience to the Pope the Supreme Pontiff, and receive and believe the faith of Jesus Christ our God, and contemn and put away from you altogether the abominable superstition of idols, the very doing of which will teach you, how holy is our law, and how false your own, and that it was

entirely, or to decline the chance of an augmentation of knowledge, because it cannot be deprived of liability to error.

que el mismo hecho te dira quan santa es nuestra ley, y quan falsa la tuya, y que la inventó el Diablo. Todo lo qual o Rey si me crees deues otorgar de buena gana, porque á ti y á todos los tuyos conuiene muy mucho: y si lo negares sabete que seras apremiado con guerra á fuego y á sangre, y todos tus idolos seran derribados por tierra y te constriñiremos con la espada á que, dexando tu falsa religion, que quieras que no quieras, récibas nuestra Fé catholica, y pagues tributo á nuestro Emperador, entregandole el Reyno. Si procurares porfiar lo, y resistir con animo obstinado, tendras por muy cierto permitira Dios, que como antiguamente Pharaon, y todo su exercito perecio en el mar bermejo; assi tu y todos tus Yndios seais destruidos por nuestras armas.

invented of the Devil. All of which, O King, if you will take my word, you ought to concede with a willing mind, for as much as it is greatly for the advantage of you and all who belong to you. And if you refuse, know that you shall be repaid with war, to fire and blood, and all your idols shall be thrown to the ground, and we will constrain you by the sword to leave your false religion whether you will or no, and receive our Catholic faith, and pay tribute to our Emperor, and make over to him the kingdom. And if you attempt to oppose him, and to resist with an obstinate spirit, hold for certain that God will permit, that as of old time Pharaoh and all his host perished in the Red Sea, so you and all your Indians shall perish by our arms."

This oration was interpreted to King Atahuallpa by an Indian, whom the Spanish author calls Phelipe and sometimes *Philipillo* (which is a contemptuous familiarity like *Johnny* for John), a native of the island of Puna, who had been born a slave among the Spaniards, and spoke no language at all except a dialect of Indian "like the wood negroes" [como los negros bocales], and though baptized, had no knowledge of the Christian religion, "not so much as to know who Christ was, or be acquainted with the Apostles' creed." The difficulties into which this negociator fell, are worth recording in the words of the author.

Tal y tan auentajado fue el primer interprete que tuuo el Peru, y llegando á su interpretacion es de saber que la hizo mala y de contrario sentido; no porque lo quisiesse hazer maliciosamente sino porque no entendia lo que interpretaua y que lo dezia como vn papagayo: y por dezir Dios trino y uno dixo, Dios tres y uno son quatro, sumando los numeros por darse á entender. Consta

"Such and so qualified was the first interpreter Peru had. And touching his interpretation, it is to be stated, that he made it badly and quite beside the mark; not that he intended to do so out of malice, but because he did not understand what he was interpreting, but said it like a parrot. And instead of saying "God trine and one" he said, "God three and one are four," adding the numbers together by way of making himself understood. This is ascertained by the testimony of

Wherever there is uncertainty, there is the possibility of being wrong; yet the greatest part of human prudence is exerted in

esto por la tradicion de los Quipus, que son los fiudos añiales de Cassamarca, donde passó el hecho, y no pudo dezirlo de otra manera porque para declarar muchas cosas de la Religion Christiana, no ay vocablos ni manera de dezir en aquel lenguage del Peru, como dezir Trinidad, trino y uno, persona, Spiritu Sancto, Fé, gracia, Yglesia, Sacramentos, y otras palabras semejantes, porque totalmente las inoran aquellos gentiles, como palabras que no tuuieron en su lenguage, ni oy las tienen.

—es assi que el Yndio Phelipe dixo otras muchas cosas semejantes á la passada: que de la generacion de Adan dió á entender, que huuo tiempo en que estuuieron juntos todos los hombres del mundo nascidos y por nascer, y dixo que todos amontonaron sus pecados en Adan, por dezir que todos pecaron en Adan, nascidos y por nascer, y de la diuinidad de Christo nuestro señor, no dixo nada, mas de que fue un gran varon que murio por los hombres, y de la virginidad, limpieza, y santidad de nuestra Señora la Virgen Maria dixo mucho menos.

the Quipus, which are the knots containing the history of Cussamarca, where the fact took place; and he could not say it in any other manner, because to express many things in the Christian religion, there are neither words nor ways in that language of Peru,—as for instance, Trinity, Trine and One, Person, Holy Spirit, Faith, Grace, Church, Sacraments, and other words of the like kind, in as much as those gentiles are entirely ignorant of them, as being words which they never had in their language, and have not to this day."

"In the same manner it was, that the Indian Philip said many other things like to the preceding. For instance, concerning the generation of Adam he gave it to be understood, that there was a time when all the men in the world, born and to be born, were assembled in one place; and then, he said they all heaped up their sins upon Adam, instead of saying that all the men born and to be born sinned in Adam. And of the divinity of Christ our Lord, he said nothing, except that he was a tall man who died for the rest; and of the virginity, purity, and sanctity of our Lady the Virgin Mary, he said much worse than nothing at all."

The answer of King Atahuallpa is given with the same simplicity as the rest.

El Rey Atahuallpa auiendo oydo lo vltimo de la oracion, que era renunciar sus reynos de grado ó por fuerça, y quedar por tributario, y que lo mandaua el Papa, y que el Emperador lo queria: y las amenaças que le hizieron con las armas á fuego y á sangre, y la destruycion que por el y por los suyos auia de venir como la de Pharaon, y de todo su ex-

'When King Atahuallpa had heard the conclusion of the oration, which was that he was to renounce his kingdoms by consent or force, and remain a tributary, and that the Pope ordered it and the Emperor desired it, and the threats they made against him with weapons of fire and blood, and the destruction which was to come on him and his, like that of Pharaoh and all his host,—he became sorrowful, imagining that what he and his

judging of what is neither certain, nor reducible to inviolable rules.

---

ercito, se entristecio, imaginando que aquellos aquien el y sus Indios llamauan Viracochas, creyendo que eran dioses, se le convertian y hazian enemigos mortales, pidiendole cosas tan asperas; y dió un gemido con esta voz Atac, que quiere dezir ay dolor, y con esta interjection dió á entender la gran pena que auia sentido de auer oydo la vltima parte del razonamiento, y templando su passion respondio lo siguiente:

Gran contento fuera para mi, que ya que me negauedes todas las otras cosas que á vuestros mensajeros pedí, á lo menos me concedierades sola una, y era que dierades lugar á hablarme por interprete mas sabio y esperimentado, y mas fiel, porque la vrbanidad y vida politica de los hombres mas ayna se sabe, y aprende por la habla que no por las mismas costumbres: que aunque seays dotado de muy grandes virtudes, sino me las declarays por palabras, no podré por la vista y esperiencia entenderlas con facilidad, y si esta necesidad ay entre todas las gentes y naciones mucho mayor la deue de auer entre los que son de tan alejadas regiones como nos otros; por lo qual, si estos tales, si quieren tratar y hablar por mensajeros, ó interpretes inorantes dela vna lengua y dela otra, será tanto como hablarse por bestias domesticas, digo esto, varon de Dios, porque no dexo de entender que significa otra cosa las palabras que has hablado que lo que este fraute me ha dicho: porque el mismo negocio lo requiere, porque auiendo de tratar de paz y amistad, y de hermandad perpetua, y aun de paren-

Indians called Viracochas and believed were gods, had turned against him and become his mortal enemies, from making such ruthless demands. And he gave a groan and uttered the word '*Atac*,' which means 'Woe's me;' and by this interjection he gave to be understood the great pain he had felt at hearing the concluding part of the discourse; and restraining his feelings he answered as follows.

" It would have been a great satisfaction to me, if after denying me everything else I requested of your messengers, you would at least have granted me one thing, which was, that you would have contrived to speak to me through a wiser and more skilful interpreter, and more faithful. Because the intelligence and political habits of a man are more easily known and discovered by his language, than even by his manners in general. And though you may be gifted with very great virtues, —if you do not explain them to me by words, I shall never be able by sight and experience to comprehend them with readiness; and if this necessity exists among all people and nations, much more must it take place between those who are of such remote parts of the world as we are. From which it is clear, that if such as they, undertake to treat and converse with each other by means of messengers or interpreters who neither know one language nor the other, it will be all the same as trying to speak to one other by some kind of domestic brute animals. I say this, O man of God, because I cannot fail to be aware that there must be a difference between the meaning of the words which you have spoken, and what this communicant has said to me. For the subject itself points out, that having to treat of peace and amity, and of perpetual brotherhood, and even family connexion as I was told by the other messengers

The account given of the mode in which the specimens in question were brought into their present situation, though ex-

---

tesco como me dixeron los otros mensageros que fueron á hablarme, suena aora en contrario todo lo que este Indio me ha dicho, que nos amenazas con guerra y muerte á fuego y á sangre, y con destierro y destruycion de los Incas, y de su parentela, y que por fuerça ó de grado he de renunciar mi reyno, y hazerme vassallo tributario de otro. De lo qual colixo vna de dos, ó que vuestro Principe y todos vosotros soys tiranos que andays destruyendo el mundo, quitando Reynos agenos, matando y robando á los que no os han hecho injuria, ni os deuen nada: ó que soys ministros de Dios á quien nosotros llamamos Pachacamac, que os ha elegido para castigo y destruycion nuestra. Y si es assi, mis vassallos y yo nos ofrecemos á la muerte, y á todo lo que de nosotros quisieredes hazer, no por temor que tengamos de vuestras armas y amenazas, sino por cumplir lo que mi padre Huaynacapac dexó mandado á la hora de su muerte, que siruiessemos, y honrasemos vna gente barbuda como vosotros, que auia de venir despues de sus dias; dela qual tuuo noticia años antes, que andauan por la costa de su imperio, dixonos que auian de ser hombres de mejor ley, mejores costumbres, mas sabios, mas valerosos que nosotros. Por lo qual cumpliendo el decreto y testamento de mi padre, os auemos llamado Viracochas, entendiendo que soys mensajeros del gran Dios Viracocha cuya voluntad y justa indignacion armas y potencia no se pueda resistir: pero tambien tiene piedad y misericor-

who came to speak to me, all that this Indian has said to me sounds now directly the contrary; about your threatening us with war and death by fire and sword, and the banishment and destruction of the Incas and their line, and that by force or consent I am to renounce my kingdom and make myself a tributary subject to somebody else. From which I gather one of two things; either that your Prince and all of you are tyrants that go about destroying the world, taking other people's kingdoms, killing and robbing those who never did you any harm, nor owe you anything; or else that you are the ministers of God whom we call Pachacamac, who has chosen you for our punishment and destruction. And if it is the last, then my subjects and myself offer ourselves to death, and to anything you may please to do with us; not through any fear we have of your arms and threats, but to fulfil what my father Huaynacapac left in charge at the hour of his death, that we should serve and honour a bearded nation like you, which was to come after his days; of whom he had information many years before, when they were on their passage by the coast of his empire, and told us that they were to be men of a better law, better customs, more wise and more courageous than ourselves. For which reason, in compliance with the decree and last will of my father, we have named you Viracochas; meaning that you are messengers of the great God Viracocha, whose will and just indignation no arms or power can resist, but who still has compassion and mercy. You ought therefore to act as messengers and ministers of the divinity, and not allow any more of the slaughters, robberies, and cruelties, which have been committed in Tumpiz and its border."

traordinary, is not impossible. There is nothing in it that may not very well have been; which is more than can be said of many accounts, that pass currently for veritable history.

---

dia. Por tanto deueys hazer como mensajeros y ministros diuinos, y no permitir que passe adelante las muertes, robos y crueldades, que en Tumpiz y su comarca se han hecho.

Demas desto me ha dicho vuestro faraute que me proponeys cinco varones señalados, que deuo conocer. El primero es el Dios tres y vno que son quatro, á quien llamays criador del vniverso, por ventura es el mismo que nosotros llamamos Pachacamac, y Viracocha. El segundo es el que dizes que es padre de todos los otros hombres, en quien todos ellos amontonaron sus pecados. Al tercero llamays Iesu Christo, solo el qual no echó sus pecados en aquel primer hombre: pero que fue muerto. Al quarto nombrays Papa. El quinto es Carlos aquien sin hazer cuenta de los otros, llamays poderosissimo y monarca del vniuerso, y supremo á todos. Pues si este Carlos es principe y señor de todo el mundo, que necesidad tenia de que el Papa le hiziera nueua concession y donacion para hazerme guerra y vsurpar estos Reynos? y si la tenia luego el Papa es mayor señor que no el, y mas poderoso, y principe de todo el mundo? Tambien me admiro que digais que estoy obligado á pagar tributo á Carlos y no á los otros, porque no days ninguna razon para el tributo, ni yo me hallo obligado á darlo por ninguna via. Porque si de derecho huuiesse de dar tributo y seruicio paresceme, que se auia de dar aquel Dios que dizes que nos crió á todos, y á aquel primer hombre

"Besides this, your communicant has told me, that you mention five particular persons I ought to be acquainted with. The first is the God three and one which are four, whom you call creator of the universe; possibly it is the same we call Pachacamac and Viracocha. The second is the one you say is father of all the other men, on whom they all heaped up their sins. The third you call Jesus Christ, who was the only one that did not put his sins upon that first man: because he was dead. The fourth you name Pope. The fifth is Carlos, whom without reckoning any of the rest, you call the most powerful, and monarch of the universe, and supreme above all. Now if this Carlos is prince and sovereign of all the world, what necessity was there for the Pope's making him a fresh grant and donation to make war upon me and usurp these kingdoms? And if there was, it follows that the Pope is a greater sovereign than he, and more powerful, and prince of all the world. I do also wonder why you say I am bound to pay tribute to Carlos, and not to the others; for you give me no reason for the tribute, nor do I see why I should be obliged to pay it at all. For if by right there was a tribute and service to be given, it seems to me that it would be to be given to that God who you say created us all, and to that first man who was father of all men, and that Jesus Christ who never heaped up his sins, and lastly it would be to be given to the Pope who can give away and grant my kingdom and person to other people. But if you say that I do not owe anything to these, still less do I owe to Carlos, who never was sovereign of

A ship-carpenter named Alexander Strong, in the employment of Messrs. Bennett and Hunt of Wapping, declares that

---

que fuè padre de todos los hombres, y aquel Iesu Christo que nunca amontanó sus pecados, finalmente se auian de dar al Papa, que puede dar y conceder mis reynos y mi persona á otros. Pero si dizes que á estos no deuo nada; menos deuo á Carlos, que nunca fue señor destas regiones, ni las a visto. Y si despues de aquella concession tiene algun derecho sobre mi, fuera justo y puesto en razon, me lo declararades antes de hazerme las amenazas con guerra, fuego, sangre, y muerte; para que yo obedesciera la voluntad del Papa, que no soy tan falto de juyzio, que no obedezca aquien puede mandar con razon, justicia, y derecho.

Demas desto desseo saber de aquel bonissimo varon Iesu Christo que nunca echó sus pecados, que dizes que murio, si murio de enfermedad, ó á manos de sus enemigos? Si fue puesto entre los dioses antes de su muerte, ó despues della? Tambien desseo saber si teneis por dioses á estos cinco que me aueys propuesto pues los honrays tanto, porque si es ansi teneys mas dioses que nosotros, que no adoramos mas de al Pachacamac por supremo Dios, y al Sol por su inferior, y á la Luna por hermana y muger suya. Per todo lo qual holgara en estremo, que me dierades á entender estas cosas por otro mejor faraute, para que yo las supiera y obedesciera vuestra voluntad. —*Historia General del Peru: escrita por el Ynca Garcilasso de la Vega. Cordova.* 1617. *Parte II. Cap.* 21—24.

Por la esperiencia que el Inca tenia de la torpeza del

these countries, nor ever saw them. And if through this grant of the Pope's he possesses any right over me, it would have been but just and reasonable to tell me of it, before you made me these threats of war, fire, blood, and death; that I might yield obedience to the will of the Pope, because I am not so void of sense as not to obey any person who can issue a mandate with reason, justice, and right."

"Besides this, I want to know about that very good man Jesus Christ, who never put his sins with the others, and who you say died;—whether he died of sickness, or by the hands of his enemies? and whether he was placed among the gods before his death or after? I also wish to know whether you count as gods those five that you have mentioned to me; since you honour them so much. Because if you do, you have more gods than we have, who worship no more than Pachacamac for supreme god, and the sun for his under god, and the moon for his sister and wife. On the whole therefore I should be extremely delighted, if you would give me to understand these matters through another better communicant, that I might know them and comply with your desire."

'From the experience the Inca had had of the stupidity of the interpreter, he took care to accom-

in June 1823 he purchased the Quipos and box in question, from the mate of a merchant-brig, whose name was Robert

interprete, tuuo cuydado de acomodarse con ella en su respuesta en dos cosas. La vna en dezirla á pedaços para que el faraute la entendiera mejor y la declarara por partes: y dicha vna parte, le dezia otra, y assi todas las demas hasta la fin. La otra aduertencia fue que habló en el language de Chinchaysuyu, el qual entendia mejor el faraute, por ser mas comun en aquellas prouincias, que no el del Cozco: y por esta causa pudo Phelipe entender mejor la intencion y las razones del Inca, y declararlas aunque barbaramente. Luego que las huuo dicho mandaron á los contadores que son los que tienen cargo de los ñudos que las assentassen y pusiessen en su tradicion.

A este tiempo los Españoles no pudiendo sufrir la prolixidad del razonamiento, salieron de sus puestos y arremetieron con los Indios para pelear con ellos, y quitarles las muchas joyas de oro y plata, y piedras preciosas que (como gente que venia á oyr la embaxada del Monarca del vniuerso) auian echada sobre sus personas, para mas solenizar el mensage; y otros Españoles subieron á vna torrezilla, á despojar vn idolo que allí auia, adornado con muchas planchas de oro y plata, y piedras preciosas: con lo qual se alborotaron los Indios, y leuantaron grandissimo ruydo. El Inca viendo lo que passaua mandó á los suyos á grandes vozes, que no hiriessen, ni ofendiessen á los Españoles, aunque prendiessen ó matassen al mismo Rey. Aquí dize el padre Blas Valera, que como Dios nuestro Señor con la presencia de la Reyna Esther

modate himself to it in his reply in two respects. The first was, that he spoke it by a little at a time, that the interpreter might understand it better, and deliver it piece-meal; and when he had spoken one part, he spoke the next, and so on to the end. And the other precaution was, that he spoke in the language of Chinchaysuyu, which the interpreter better understood, as being more common in those provinces than that of Cozco; and for this reason Philip could better understand the meaning and intentions of the Inca, and interpret them, though after a barbarous fashion. As soon as he had uttered these, *the story-tellers, who are the people who have charge of the knots, were ordered to set them down, and put them in their account.*'

'By this time the Spaniards being unable to endure the lengthiness of the discourse, moved forward from their posts and closed with the Indians to fight with them, and to take from them their numerous ornaments of gold and silver and precious stones, which, as people who had come to hear the embassy of the Monarch of the universe, they had put upon their persons by way of doing more honour to its receipt. And other Spaniards went up to a little tower, to plunder an idol which stood there, adorned with many plates of gold and silver, and precious stones; upon which the Indians rose in confusion, and raised a prodigious noise. The Inca seeing what was going on, ordered his people aloud, not to strike or hurt the Spaniards, even though they seized or killed the king himself. Here Father Blas Valera says, that as God our Lord by the presence of Queen Esther changed into mildness the enraged spirit of King Ahasuerus, so by the presence of the holy cross which the good Friar Vicente de Valverde held in his hands, he changed the proud and warlike spirit

Baker, for the sum of 10*l.* sterling. 'He says that Baker was endeavouring to dispose of them to the curiosity-shops; and

trocó en mansedumbre el animo enojado del Rey Asuero, assi con la presencia de la Santa Cruz, que el buen fray Vicente de Valuerde tenia en las manos, trocó el animo ayrado, y belicoso del Rey Atahualipa; no solamente en mansedumbre y blandura, sino en grandissima sumission y humildad: pues mandó á los suyos, que no peleassen aunque lo matassen ó prendiessen. —*Id.* c. 25.

of King Atahualipa, not only into mildness and gentleness, but into the greatest submission and humility, even to the ordering his people not to fight though the Spaniards should kill or make him prisoner.'

Garcilasso says, that a false account of the transaction was drawn up and forwarded to the Emperor.

El general Español, y sus capitanes escriuieron al Emperador la relacion, que los historiadores escriuen; y en contrario con grandissimo recato, y diligencia prohibieron entonces, que nadie escriuiesse la verdad de lo que passó; que es la que se ha dicho, la qual sin la tradicion de los fiudos historiales de aquella prouincia Casamarca, la oy á muchos conquistadores que se hallaron en aquella jornada: y El Padre Blas Valeradize, que vno dellos fue su padre Alonso Valera, aquien se la oyo contar muchas vezes. En suma dezimos, que passaron de cinco mil Indios los que murieron aquel dia. Los tres mil y quinientos fueron á hierro, y los demas fueron viejos inutiles, mugeres, muchachos, y niños, porque de ambos sexos, y de todas edades hauia venido inumerable gente á oyr, y solenizar la embaxada de los que tenian por dioses. Destos perecieron mas de mil y quinientos, que los ahogó la muchedumbre y tropel de su propria gente, y la de los cauallos.—*Id.* c. 25.

'The Spanish general and his officers wrote to the Emperor the account which is at this day given by historians; and on the other hand with the greatest care and diligence forbade at the time that anybody should write the truth of what had happened, —which nevertheless is as has been said, and which, *besides the testimony of the historical knots of that province of Casamarca*, I have heard from many of the "Conquistadores," who were present at that day's transactions; and Father Blas Valera says, that one of them was his own father Alonso Valera, whom he has heard tell it many times. On the whole we may say, that there were more than five thousand Indians that died on that day. Three thousand five hundred of these were by the sword, and the rest were useless old men, women, boys, and children; because there had come innumerable people of both sexes and all ages, to hear and do honour to the embassy of what they accounted to be gods. Of these there perished upwards of fifteen hundred, who were trampled to death by the numbers and crowding of their own people, and of the horses.'

This was religion, in the days when its professors had it all to themselves, and philosophy was no where. And this is the condition

that he (Strong) was induced to purchase them from an idea that they contained something extraordinary, and that he might obtain both reputation and profit by explaining them. That the account given by Baker was, that the box and its contents were discovered by a native of Lyons, named Rosenberg Vestus, who by a succession of accidents had become domiciliated in the family of a chief in Chili, of the tribe of Guarcos, who considered himself as a descendant of the Incas who fled from Peru before the Spaniards. That the said Vestus lived many years in the family of the chief, and (as the manner of such strangers is) married his daughter. That the chief took great delight in teaching his son-in-law the mysteries of the Quipos; and was induced by his proficiency, to leave them to him at his death, in preference to his own son. That after the death of the old chief, his son began to persecute Mr. Vestus; as has often happened in Chili and elsewhere in like cases. Upon which Mr. Vestus mounted a horse, and made his way through many perils to Buenos Ayres, carrying the Quipos before him on his saddle-bow. That arriving in Buenos Ayres in a state bordering on nudity, he sold the box and Quipos there to Baker for certain suits of European clothes; turning over to him at the same time all the information in his power, by way of enhancing the value of the bargain. Such is the story; for the truth of which Mr. Strong is evidently no further answerable, than for having received it from Baker. Other circumstances collected from the same kind of darkling and traditionary testimony, are, that the writer of the key was a Spanish missionary or ecclesiastic, who lived nobody can tell when; that the figures of buildings on the box, represent the temple of the sun and the temple of the moon, as they stood at some time equally unknown; that

---

from which philosophy—which means the exercise of the common sense given to man antecedently to all religions—has raised the world; and to which, or something of the same kind, men would revert if it was possible for philosophy to cease to operate. It is good to know the nature of Quipos; but it is good to know something of the other too. And this is not the sarcastic account of an adversary; but comes into the world with the full permission of the most Holy Inquisition, and license of the Archbishop of Cordova. It would appear that in those days of simplicity, it had not entered into the heads of the supporters of the dominant faith, that it could possibly be made ridiculous. It may suit men to cry out against the application of ridicule as a test of religions;—but see what the religious made of themselves, in the times when nobody had thought of it.

Vestus obtained great favour in the eyes of the old cacique, by undertaking to re-gild the box, an operation of which something like the vestiges may be traced on one of its sides; and that he revived the colours on the knots, after the manner of English church-wardens, by painting them with their present pigments in imitation of the old.

When Mr. Strong got possession of the box, he applied himself to decypher its contents. He knew no Latin,—which is the language in which the accessible part of the key is written; but he says he purchased a Latin dictionary, and proceeded to make out the Latin words,—a work in itself of no small difficulty, in consequence of their being written in a hand which does not readily strike the eye as being intended for any character at all,—and to write down their meaning from his dictionary. He next compared the knots on the Quipos with those on the key, and noted down, *tant bien que mal*, the several roots or meanings at which he thus arrived; and he produces three thin folios containing the results of his labours in this direction. Finally, from the succession of words or ideas thus obtained, he has endeavoured,—by dint of considerable liberty of paraphrase, and, as far as can be judged, with varying success,—to elicit a continuous meaning or history.

Of the correctness of his account of his own proceedings, there appears no valid reason to doubt. He produces the best confirmatory evidence—that of his own studies and exercitations. And a very curious instance they present, of the intense desire of knowledge implanted in the human breast, and the degree in which this desire is participated by individuals in the most laborious classes of European society. Peter working as a ship-carpenter in the dock-yard at Zaardam, is scarcely a more remarkable object, than a ship-carpenter undertaking to teach himself Latin, for the purpose of extracting a history of Peru from a cable's length of cat-gut. The individual does not disguise that the hope of profit was one part of his incentive; any more than Mr. Brougham or Mr. Abernethy disguises his intention of growing rich by his profession. But in one case as in the other, the mere hope of gain does certainly seem inadequate to the effect produced. The love of money makes diligent workmen, careful shopkeepers, and every now and then a lord mayor; but it does not make ship-carpenters spend laborious hours on such a barren lottery as *Knot* learning, or give £10 for a library of small cords to begin their studies.

The Quipos or what purport to be such, consist of seven bunches, which may by analogy be called volumes. Each volume is composed of a ring, of from three to six inches diameter in different specimens, formed apparently from a sinew of

some large animal, but so covered with lacker and paints as to make it difficult to be certain of the precise substance. The ring is in most cases made by tying the two ends of the sinew together, and the protuberance thus formed may reasonably be supposed to mark the beginning and end of the volume. As the mode of tying seems to be in no two cases exactly alike, it is possible that some distinction may be intended by this circumstance; and in one or two of the smallest volumes, there is an approach to concealing the junction altogether, the place of beginning being however indicated by a gap in the strings which form the lines. The assertion of the interpreter is, that he finds the history to commence with the smallest volume, and to proceed in the order of magnitudes to the largest, without any division or conclusion of the sense at the end of a volume.

From the circumference of each ring proceed from thirty to a hundred strings, of what looks like cat-gut, of the thickness of the smallest string of a violin; each string being between twelve and fifteen inches long, and united at both ends to the ring, so as to form what in a riband would be called a bow. These bows extend themselves in a direction nearly perpendicular to the plane of the ring, and on one side of it; so as to produce a degree of resemblance to a crown or head-dress. On each string are from ten to thirty knots, of different degrees of complexity, from a simple *thorow-put*, to a complication of loops and twists of three quarters of an inch in diameter which might put a trout-fisher in mind of an artificial fly. The knots and intervening portions of the string are covered with a substance which gives them the appearance of having been dipped in sealing-wax; the colour being for the most part green, but in some of the knots yellow, and in others red.

On this construction it is clear, that it is only necessary for the reader to know in which direction he is to pursue the succession of words and lines, to proceed with as much regularity as in a European book. And the assertion of the interpreter is, that he finds the way to read is to hold the ring in the left hand, with the bows towards the right,—pursuing the knots from that end of the bow which is furthest from the centre of the ring, towards the other,—and taking the bows in the order which leads *from* the body of the reader, and not towards it.

What is produced as the key, consists of five strips of leather or skin, of from five to eleven inches broad in different specimens, and from twelve to forty inches long. The skins are covered on both sides, with what might pass for unintelligible scrawls, but on examination prove to be Latin words, written

in an antique and very regular hand, with a brownish ink without body, like the ink used by the Foulahs and other nations of the interior of Africa, which is more like a dye than an ink, and is understood to be the juice of a plant. The intervals between the lines are occupied by a succession of dots, made with the same materials as the colouring of the knots, and which are consequently the daubing of Vestus. The vacant spaces at the ends of the lines are occupied by figures of warriors, utensils, and animals, done in the manner of *silhouettes*, with the same ink as the writing,—and sometimes by unmeaning flourishes. At the bottom of one skin is a representation of a combat, by ten or twelve warriors on a side, armed with bows and hatchets, and some of them bearing banners upon poles. The Latin frequently presents the genitive of nouns along with the nominative, and the perfect and supine of verbs with the infinitive, as *pes pedis*, *spoliare avi atum*. Sometimes two or more words are given, with the intention, apparently, of explaining one by the other, as *probo faveo;* and in some instances there are still longer strings of words forming a kind of sentence. But in all these cases the words and syllables are joined together as if they formed one word; which considerably increases the difficulty of deciphering. On the side next the heads of the words, the skin is doubled backward, for about the breadth of half an inch, and retained in this position by being what sempstresses would call *run* with a piece of the cat-gut. From the edge formed by this doubling, proceed a row of knots, each placed with great accuracy opposite to the beginning of a word; and of course the knots on the left hand are those which refer to the side of the skin which happens to be uppermost. On most of the skins the knots have a turn of the string close to the skin, which is intended only to fix the whole in its place, and consequently counts for nothing as a symbol; and from this to the symbolic part, there is an interval of about a quarter of an inch. In one of the skins, the knots are all painted yellow; and it is evident on inspection of the Latin words adjoined, that they are the numerals. In another the knots are red; and from the uncouthness of the words assigned to them, they may be presumed to be proper names. In the three remaining skins the knots are green, and the Latin words assigned to them are composed of all the parts of speech not included in the other two classes. The knots in the Quipos themselves are coloured according to their classes. As far therefore as the leathern key can be trusted to, the meaning of the different colours is explained.

On examining the numerical system of knot-writing, it is evident that what algebraists call the *local value*, is *three*. For

example, *unus*, one, is typified by the simplest of all possible knots, or what a sempstress makes on a thread previously to taking the first stitch. *Duo*, two, is expressed by putting the end through once more before drawing tight; as a sempstress does when it is desired to increase the magnitude of the knot. And *tres*, three, is expressed by performing the same operation an additional time. But *quatuor*, four, assumes a new conformation, for it is expressed by a *loop*, of the simplest kind, such as is made, in nautical language, by taking a bend on the bight of the rope; and *five* is expressed by the same kind of loop, with an additional twist in the *clinch*, or part where the whole is drawn tight; and *six*, has another twist still. *Seven* is another kind of loop, which is manifestly different from *four*, though it would probably puzzle a forecastle-man to define the difference in words. *Eight* is the same with the addition of another twist in the clinch, and *nine* with another. *Ten* is no loop at all, but a portentous kind of a knot, such as might be made in a cat-o'-nine-tails where the object was to kill. *Eleven* is the same with an additional twist in the *clinch*; and *twelve* with another. *Thirteen* is the same kind of knot as *ten*, only with a loop sprouting out on one side; and *fourteen* and *fifteen* distinguish themselves by their twists as before. In this manner the system goes on to a hundred,—for so far the unknown apocalypst has chosen to carry his operations;—exhibiting a new knot at every third numeral, and expressing the two next by additions at the clinch. The knots, as may readily be imagined, in time grow exceedingly complicated and artificial; but they invariably adhere to the *ternary* system described. It may occur as not impossible, that such a circumstance may have been at the bottom of the assertion made with respect to certain American nations, *that they could count no further than three;* though this would be as manifestly untrue, as that the Europeans can count no further than ten.

The inditer of the Latin version is evidently a man attached to counting by fifties and by hundreds; for he stops at fifty on one side of his skin, and at a hundred on the other. But the mode in which the numerals are expressed in Latin, can only be accounted for by supposing him to have had a very limited knowledge of the tongue. Up to three-and-thirty he proceeds with success in the ordinary way, except that he generally omits the *t* in *quatuor;* but for thirty-four he chuses to say *bis septemdecim;* for thirty-five, *unus et bis septemdecim;* for thirty-six, *bis octodecim;* and so on. Sixty-nine is *ter tres-et-viginti;* and seventy is expressed by *unus et ter tres-et-viginti*. Ninety is expressed by *ter trinta*, which looks like the blunder of a Spaniard, accustomed to express thirty by *trenta*.

That it is not meant for a contraction, is proved by the vacant space at the end of the line being filled up by a long flourish; while in the next line *triginta* is written at full length, though at the expense of crowding its final letters against the margin. The author appears not to have known the Latin for any of the tens between thirty and a hundred. A remarkable instance of accuracy occurs in one part of his catalogue. The writer has omitted *ninety-three* in his column of words; and there was therefore nothing to be done but to insert it at the end, after *centum* a hundred. This presents an opportunity of trying the accuracy of his knots. For ninety-one, as will be perceived by any person who has attended to the system as described, ought to commence a new *triad* of knots; ninety-two should be the same, with one twist in the clinch; but ninety-four, which, in consequence of the error, stands next, should be a new kind of knot altogether; while ninety-three, which is to be looked for at the bottom of the column, should be the same as ninety-two, only with one more twist. The whole of which is found to be the case with perfect exactness.

The number of knots in the skin of proper names is 102; and in the three collections of green knots, 231; so that with the addition of the hundred numerals, the whole number of knots or ideagraphic symbols is 433.

The box in which the keys and Quipos are contained is cut out of a solid block, and covered with figures, and gilt. Its length is eighteen inches, and its breadth and height each eight inches and a half. The lid fastens with a secret bolt, which moves upon turning the figure of a woman among the ornaments at one end; and a good deal of curious and not very explicable carpentry is displayed both in this and in the mode in which the lid is made to slide. On the lid of the box, the principal figure represents a feather-cinctured warrior, armed with a bow and arrows, mounted on a four-footed animal with wings and a fish's tail. In line with one of the wings is represented a bird in full flight, intended probably to indicate that the beast was keeping up with its motion; and near the tail of the four-footed animal is a miniature representation of a curled snake, which may be intended to represent the quality of destructiveness, as the other represents velocity. The interpreter Mr. Strong declares, that he finds this figure alluded to in the *text*, and that it is there intimated to be the representation of a figure seen in a dream by one of the Incas, previously to the arrival of the bearded centaurs who struck such terror into the Peruvian state. The only anachronism suggested by the representation, is perhaps, that the rider sits too well for the produce of a dream; but it does not appear essential to the

genuineness, that the carver should never have seen an individual on horseback. An instance of connection between the box and its contents, is that the bow of the riding figure is represented with a superfluity consisting in about one-fourth of the wooden part projecting beyond the insertion of the string, and that the same peculiarity is observable in the representations of bows which appear upon the key. The spaces round this principal figure are occupied by representations of animals, in which and in other parts of the box, may be recognized the lynx, long-tailed lemur, ostrich, gymnotus electricus, opossum, sloth, cameleon, alligator, coati-mondi, monkey, toucan, wild turkey, ant-bear, rat, spermaceti whale, tortoise, llama, shark, racoon, wild hog, besides birds of the genus *passer;* the whole interwoven with a multitude of snakes, and the edges occupied by something like an eternity-border of the same reptiles.

Of the two long sides, one represents a building in the shape of a crescent, forming a sort of piazza, of which thirty-three arches or pillars are distinctly pourtrayed; the whole number, including those which are concealed by their position, being probably forty. The drawing is a kind of bird's eye view, displaying some knowledge of perspective. The other side, which is what appears to have been re-gilt, represents a building—which heaven send be not the palace of the viceroy of the Indies—but it is certainly not the Escurial, nor the convent of St. Domingo at Buenos Ayres. It consists of three stories, and in some parts more; and has a circular dome, apparently with an opening in the top to let in the light. One peculiarity about it is, that, with the exception of the dome, all the *arches* (if the word may be allowed) are formed by compositions of straight lines, and not of curved. Over the three doors are three figures; of which the extreme one in the direction of the spectator's left hand, represents a sheaf of arrows with a circular shield in the middle, an object which occurs in the Mexican representations of Purchas (vol. iii. p. 1113). The extreme one on the right, is a female figure, drest like that which constitutes the lock, and like another represented in the moon. The figure over the middle and principal entrance,—exceedingly resembling a sign-post lion, with his tail over his back and two tobacco leaves on his head for a crown,—is discoverable among the figures on the skins which form the key; and the tobacco crown, though not the wild beast, is discernible in the engravings to the 'Description of the Ruins of an Ancient City, discovered near Palenque, by Captain Don Antonio del Rio,' published by Berthoud, 65, Regent's Quadrant, in 1822.

This temple or whatever it is, is avowedly a staggering object. It is scarcely possible to conceive, that the sculptor had

not, in some way or other, had communication with Gothic or European architecture. It will be seen, however, on comparison with the text of Garcilasso de la Vega, that the representation is by no means so remote from that of some of the early Peruvian buildings as might be imagined*. It is remarkable, that neither this nor any part of the whole collection, contains any vestige of Catholicity,—not so much as a crucifix or a St. Iago, nor a saint, male, female, or epicene,—unless the lady of the lock, instead of being a Virgin of the Sun, is assumed to be one of the Eleven Thousand. On the whole perhaps a fair conclusion would be, that the representation in question was really intended for one of the ancient Peruvian buildings,—possibly the very one into which Pizarro and De Soto were put at Cozco;—but strained through the imagination of some Indian of a few generations afterwards, who could not help having seen the edifices of the Spaniards, though he detested their mythology.

The two smaller ends of the box contain representations of a woman in the sun, and a woman in the moon; of whom the last has apparently a basket in her hand, and a vessel of a different form upon her head,—and the other, by turning round, serves, as already mentioned, for a lock. At the four corners of the box are figures of men in different Peruvian habits, unarmed, and standing in the posture of what are called *cariatides*. The bottom of the box is only a convolution of snakes, carelessly executed, but gilt like the rest.

* Account of the reception of Hernando Pizarro and Hernando de Soto, the two Spaniards who first arrived at Cozco.

'These two Companions proceeding on their Journey towards *Cuzco*, arrived on the high Promontory of *Carmenca*, from whence they took a survey of the Imperial City, and much admired the neighbouring Towns and Villages which encompassed, or were adjoining to it. The people coming forth to meet them, received them with joy and mirth, with Musick and Dances, erecting Triumphal Arches in the ways, crowned with Flowers and Garlands, and strowing the streets with Rushes, and lodged them in those Royal apartments, which were called *Amarucancha*, belonging to *Huayna Capac*; for being in their estimation persons of Divine Race, they allotted those Chambers for them, which appertained to their greatest and most beloved King. At the entrance thereunto was a very fair Tower, being four Stories high, each of which had a cieling of Timber, in such manner as covered the Royal Chambers, and which were so lofty, that to speak in compass, the Turret above was as high as any Spire in *Spain*, unless that of *Seville*. The top thereof was in form of a Globe, as were all the Chambers; and above all, in the place of a Weather-cock or Vayne (which the Indians did not understand), they had erected a Ball [the original says, *tenia una pica muy alta, y gruessa*, "it had a very high and stout spire"] which added much to the height, and was so large, that the hollow of it contained above sixty Foot in compass, called by them *Sunturhuaci*, which signifies as much as the rare piece of Architecture, there being no other building adjoyning thereunto to support or hide it. In my time it was thrown down or demolished, to make the Market-place more large and airy; though the truth is, it took not up much place, and now in lieu thereof the Jesuits have erected a high *Coloseo* or Pyramid, as was mentioned in the first part of this History.'—*History of Garcilasso de la Vega. Translated by Sir Paul Rycaut.*—Part II. c. 33.

Thus far the evidence in general appears to have been on the side of the authenticity of the whole. But here begins the '*Audi alteram partem;*' which it must be confessed presents things of difficult digestion, and hard to reconcile with truth. On examining the skin which contains the proper names, it is evident that it has been written by an inhabitant of the British islands. No other being could have framed four such compositions of letters as *Kennith, Sunland, Pickland, Holyland.* At first sight this might appear to be as clear evidence of collusion, as if mention had been found of Holiland's hotel in the Strand. But on consideration, there may possibly be ways in which it may be accounted for. There is no absolute impossibility in the lexicographer having been a Briton. It is quite clear, in the first place, that he was somebody; secondly, that he wrote a European hand; thirdly, that he knew Latin and not much; fourthly, that if he was a true man at all, he wrote from the oral interpretation of some Indian or other person acquainted with the meaning of the knots; all which qualities may, by possibility, have centred in a Briton. And in that case it is natural enough, that he should be found mingling some specimens of his own language, both in sound and in sense. *Sunland* and *Holyland* may well enough be interpretations of some proper names, which his Indian authorities explained to him as bearing the corresponding senses in the tongue of Cozco or Chinchaysuyu; and his consciousness that they were proper names, may have been what led him to set them down as he did, instead of employing a Latin periphrasis. For example, if one of our early navigators in the Arctic regions had received from a Greenland wizard the native name of the country, with an explanation that it meant the *land* that was *green,*—it appears quite as likely that it should have slipped into his lexicon under its present familiar form, as have appeared under the phrase of *viridis terra.* The other words may have been misrepresentations of sounds which only resembled them; a practice very accordant with the habits of unlearned Britons, and probably of unlearned persons of all other nations upon earth.

A more serious difficulty occurs on the subject of numbers. How come a people whose numerary system advances by threes, to reckon by hundreds, and say "king Args lived twelve hundred moons and died sixty hundred moons after the battle between the Sun and Moon"? But even this, perhaps, may be answered by saying, that this identical collection of knots was not edited, till the editors had been enlightened on the subject of decimal arithmetic by the Spaniards. Perhaps in an earlier edition it might have been read, that Args lived thir-

teen times ninety-nine moons. There is no necessity for supposing any part of the present compositions to be of earlier date than the arrival of the Spaniards. The only question is, whether they may not have been the performance of some person in possession of the knowledge of the knot-records, and consequently be objects of considerable curiosity both for their construction and their contents.

A number of names presenting an ominous approximation to European sounds, are possibly capable of explanation on the same principles. Such are *Barbara, Columba, Gothlan, Roma, Salterdo, Mantuz, Gameldevow, Exode, Tradener, Elemendor, Thomas, Febor, Lune, Kros.* On the subject of *Thomas,* it may be worth mentioning, that a certain mysterious chief-priest of Tula, if he was not the apostle Thomas, was at all events determined by the Spaniards and their descendants to have been so*. So that the appearance of the name Thomas,

---

* 'La cosmogonie des Mexicains, leurs traditions sur la mère des hommes, déchue de son premier état de bonheur et d'innocence; l'idée d'une grande inondation, dans laquelle une seule famille s'est échappée sur un radeau; l'histoire d'un édifice pyramidal élevé par l'orgueil des hommes et détruit par la colère des Dieux; les cérémonies d'ablution pratiquées à la naissance des enfans; ces idoles faites avec la farine de maïs pétrie, et distribuées en parcelles au peuple rassemblé dans l'enceinte des temples; ces déclarations de péchés faites par les pénitens; ces associations religieuses ressemblant à nos couvens d'hommes et de femmes; cette croyance universellement répandue, que des hommes blancs à longue barbe, et d'une grande sainteté de mœurs, avoient changé le système religieux et politique des peuples; toutes ces circonstances avoient fait croire aux religieux qui accompagnoient l'armée des Espagnols lors de la conquête, qu'à une époque très-reculée le christianisme avoit été prêché dans le nouveau continent. Des savans Mexicains (*) crurent reconnoître l'apôtre Saint Thomas dans ce personnage mystérieux, grand-prêtre de Tula, que les Cholulains connoissoient sous le nom de Quetzalcoatl. Il n'est pas douteux que le Nestorianisme, mêlé aux dogmes des Bouddhistes et des Chamans, (†) ne se soit répandu, par la Tartarie des Mantchoux, dans le nord-est de l'Asie; on pourroit donc supposer, avec quelque apparence de raison, que des idées chrétiennes ont été communiquées, par la même voie, aux peuples Mexicains, surtout aux habitans de cette région boréale de laquelle sortirent les Toltèques, et que nous devons considérer comme l'*officina virorum* du nouveau monde.'—*Voyage de Humboldt et Bompland, I ère partie. Rélation Historique,* p. 84.

'The cosmogony of the Mexicans,—their traditions on the subject of the mother of mankind, falling from her first estate of happiness and innocence,—the notion of a great inundation, in which a solitary family escaped upon a raft,—the account of a building like a pyramid, raised by the pride of mankind and destroyed by the anger of the gods,—the ceremonies of ablution practised at the birth of children,—their idols made of maize flour kneaded into paste, and distributed in portions to the people collected in the inclosure of the temples,—their confessions of sin made by penitents,—their religious associations like our convents of men and of women,—the belief universally extended, that white men with long beards, and of great sanctity of manners, had changed the religious and political system of their countrymen,—all these circumstances together, had led the ecclesiastics who accompanied the army of the Spaniards at the time of the conquest, to believe that at some very remote period Christi-

(*) Siguenza, *Opera ined.* Eguiara, *Bibl. Mexicana,* p. 78.
(†) Langlès, *Rituel des Tartares-Mantchoux,* p. 9 et 14. Georgi, *Alphab. tibetanum,* p. 298.

is rather favourable to authenticity than the contrary; at all events the case would have been much worse, if the person mentioned had been John.

But a more alarming thing still, is that the interpreter in his ignorance falls foul of what may be called the *synonymes*, and writes *levis* for *light*, where there is manifestly intended the *light* of the sun. And what is worse, he is found writing *diu* and *dum* in distinct places in his key, while the use made of them in the text manifestly implies that *diu dum* is intended to stand for *a long while*. This last blunder is certainly a strong trial of endurance; for it is not only English in word, but in thought and in deed. On the preceding instance of mistake, the answer is at hand, that the same ignorance which led an Englishman to translate the *light* of the sun by *levis*, would make him set down *levis* in his key, and the authenticity of the text is not affected by it. But the other is incomparably more perilous; and there seems to be nothing for it but the remote possibility, that a man receiving from an Indian interpreter the idea of "a long interval of time" expressed by two terms or knots, may have set them down separately in his *dog*-Latin, in such a manner as on their junction to present the apparition of this portentous *diu dum*.

The positive contents of the knots as presented by the key, are in the main very analogous to the account given in the preceding extract from Humboldt and Bonpland. There are battles between the Sun and Moon, ending in a deluge; various white men appearing at different times upon the east shore of America, and thence very rationally concluded to have come from the sun; a great traveller called Thomas, coming from the cold regions, apparently in a sledge-diligence by way of Behring's Straits. These "besides a great many other interesting objects and remarkable events, &c. &c." are the contents of the book; which, as it may be had for almost the lowest imaginable price from the author at 17, Crown Court, Pall Mall, it would be injustice to forestall.

On the general authenticity of the knots, it is not intended

---

anity had been preached in the newly found continent. Some learned Mexicans (*) thought they discovered the apostle St. Thomas, in the mysterious personage, high priest of Tula, whom the Cholulans knew under the name of Quetzalcoatl. There is no doubt that the doctrines of the Nestorians, mixed with the opinions of the Buddhists and the Chamans, (†) found their way through Mantchou Tartary into the north-east of Asia. It is possible, therefore, to suppose with some appearance of reason, that ideas connected with Christianity may have been communicated by the same road to the Mexican races, and particularly to the inhabitants of that northern region from which the Tolteques migrated, and which may be considered as the great manufactory of men (*officina virorum*) in the new world.'—*Voyage of Humboldt and Bonpland, Part I. Historical Account*, p. 84.

to give any decided opinion. There are great difficulties in believing, and great difficulties in rejecting. As the liberal Mohammed says on a different subject, "Let there be no forcing in religion;"—all people are quite welcome to chuse their own opinion. It is however but fair to say, that the knots, as compared with the key, do really and truly represent the matter attributed to them. If they are a forgery, they are almost as great a curiosity in that view, as the productions of Chatterton and Psalmanazar. If they are authentic, it would have been lamentable to consign them to oblivion for the sake of a few difficulties. The box may perhaps be concluded without hesitation, to be a specimen of Peruvian sculpture; at a period most probably subsequent to the arrival of the Spaniards, and with some slight reservation touching the possibility of the Temple of the Sun, if it is one, being the addition of a later hand. The touchstone of the authenticity of the remainder, will be the discovery of similar productions in other places; and, as it is improbable that this specimen, if genuine, should long continue to be unique, there may have been some utility in endeavouring to fix and extend the knowledge of its existence.

(No further light has, as far as the author of the article knows, been thrown upon the subject of the specimens in question, to the date of the present reprint. The specimens are figured in Vol. IV. of the splendid work of Lord Kingsborough on the Antiquities of Mexico, published in 1830, and are believed to have been in the possession of that nobleman.)

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 July, 1829.

ART. XVI.—*Edinburgh Review, No. XCVII: Article on Mill's Essays on Government, &c.*

A GOOD enemy is sometimes worth a host of friends. In such a position the Edinburgh Review is placed, by the assault of arms made nominally against the author of the Essays, but announced at the top of the alternate pages as directed against what are there denominated Utilitarian logic and politics. If the author in question has been attacked where he was right and let alone where he was wrong, and an opening made for advancing the opinions intended to be opposed,—it may be said in courtly language (which means the language of law courts), that the learned brother has taken little by his motion.

The pith of the charge against the author of the Essays is that he has written 'an elaborate treatise on government,' and 'deduced the whole science from the assumption of certain propensities of human nature.' Now in the name of Sir

Richard Birnie and all saints, from what else *should* it be deduced? What did ever anybody imagine to be the end, object, and design of government *as it ought to be*, but the same operation on an extended scale, which that meritorious chief magistrate conducts on a limited one at Bow-street; to wit, the preventing one man from injuring another? Imagine then, that the whiggery of Bow-street were to rise up against the proposition that their science was to be deduced from 'certain propensities of human nature,' and thereon were to ratiocinate as follows.

'How then are we to arrive at just conclusions on a subject so important to the happiness of mankind? Surely by that method, which, in every experimental science to which it has been applied, has signally increased the power and knowledge of our species,—by that method for which our new philosophers would substitute quibbles scarcely worthy of the barbarous respondents and opponents of the middle ages,—by the method of Induction;—by observing the present state of the world,—by assiduously studying the history of past ages,—by sifting the evidence of facts,—by carefully combining and contrasting those which are authentic,—by generalizing with judgment and diffidence,—by perpetually bringing the theory which we have constructed to the test of new facts,—by correcting, or altogether abandoning it, according as those new facts prove it to be partially or fundamentally unsound. Proceeding thus,—patiently,—diligently,—candidly,—we may hope to form a system as far inferior in pretension to that which we have been examining, and as far superior to it in real utility, as the prescriptions of a great physician, varying with every stage of every malady, and with the constitution of every patient, to the pill of the advertising quack, which is to cure all human beings, in all climates, of all diseases.'

Fancy now,—only fancy,—the delivery of these wise words at Bow-street; and think how speedily the practical catch-poles would reply, that all this might be very fine, but as far as they had studied history, the naked story was after all, that numbers of men had a propensity to thieving, and their business was to catch them; that they too had been sifters of facts, and, to say the truth, their simple opinion was, that their brother of the red waistcoat (though they should be sorry to think ill of any man), had some how contracted a leaning to the other side, and was more bent on puzzling the case for the benefit of the defendants, than on doing the duty of good officer and true. Such would beyond all doubt be the sentence passed on such trimmers in the microcosm of Bow-street. It might not absolutely follow that they were in a plot to rob the goldsmiths' shops, or to set fire to the House of Commons; but it would be quite clear that they had got a *feeling*,—that they were in process of siding with the thieves,—and that it was not to them

that any man must look, who was anxious that pantries should be safe.

If indeed it could be proved, that Bow-street at large had been mistaken in its men;—that the flash gentlemen to whom it had been in the habit of much-directing its surveillance, were in reality meritorious persons filled with zeal for the public good, and in short the best and only representatives and guardians of the public interests;—then indeed, the opinion of the ancient and venerable thief-takers would fall down before the new discovery. And this it is, the Whigs essay to prove.

And first, 'that it is not true that all despots govern ill;'—whereon the world is in a mistake, and the Whigs have the true light. And for proof, principally,—that the king of Denmark is not Caligula. To which the answer is, that the king of Denmark is not a despot. He was put in his present situation, by the people turning the scale in his favour in a balanced contest between himself and the nobility. And it is quite clear that the same power would turn the scale the other way, the moment a king of Denmark should take into his head to be Caligula. It is of little consequence by what congeries of letters the majesty of Denmark is typified in the royal press of Copenhagen, while the real fact is that the sword of the people is suspended over his head in case of ill behaviour, as effectually as in other countries where more noise is made upon the subject. Everybody believes the sovereign of Denmark to be a good and virtuous gentleman; but there is no more superhuman merit in his being so, than in the case of a rural squire who does not shoot his land-steward, or quarter his wife with his yeomanry sabre.

It is true that there are partial exceptions to the rule, that all men use power as badly as they dare. There may have been such things as amiable negro-drivers and sentimental masters of press-gangs; and here and there, among the odd freaks of human nature, there may have been specimens of men who were 'No tyrants, though bred up to tyranny.' But it would be as wise to recommend wolves for nurses at the Foundling, on the credit of Romulus and Remus, as to substitute the exception for the general fact, and advise mankind to take to trusting to arbitrary power on the credit of these specimens.

Secondly, that a government not under the control of the community (for there is no question upon any other) '*may soon be saturated.*' Tell it not in Bow-street, whisper it not in Hatton-garden,—that there is a plan for preventing injustice by 'saturation.' With what peals of unearthly merriment, would Minos, Æacus, and Rhadamanthus be aroused upon their benches, if the "light wings of saffron and of blue" should bear

this theory into their grim domains. Why do not the owners of pocket-handkerchiefs try to "saturate"? Why does not the cheated publican beg leave to check the gulosity of his defrauder with a *repetatur haustus*, and the pummelled plaintiff neutralize the malice of his adversary by requesting to have the rest of the beating in presence of the court,—if it is not that such conduct would run counter to all the conclusions of experience, and be the procreation of the mischief it affected to destroy? Woeful is the man, whose wealth depends on his having more than somebody else can be persuaded to take from him; and woeful also is the people that is in such a case.

Thirdly, that 'though there may be some tastes and propensities that have no point of saturation, there exists a sufficient check in the desire of the good opinion of others.' The misfortune of this argument is, that no man cares for the good opinion of those he has been accustomed to wrong. If oysters have opinions, it is probable they think very ill of those who eat them in August; but small is the effect upon the autumnal glutton who engulphs their gentle substances within his own. The planter and the slave-driver care just as much about negro opinion, as the epicure about the sentiments of oysters. M. Ude throwing live eels into the fire as a kindly method of divesting them of the unwholesome oil that lodges beneath their skins, is not more convinced of the immense aggregate of good which arises to the lordlier parts of the creation, than is the gentle peer who strips his fellow man of country and of family for a wild-fowl slain. The goodly land-owner, who lives by morsels squeezed indiscriminately from the waxy hands of the cobbler and the polluted ones of the nightman, is in no small degree the object of both hatred and contempt; but it is to be feared that he is a long way from feeling them to be intolerable. The principle of '*At mihi plaudo, Ipse domi, simul ac nummos contemplor in arcâ,*' is sufficient to make a wide interval between the opinions of the plaintiff and defendant in such cases. In short, to banish law and leave all plaintiffs to trust to the desire of reputation on the opposite side, would only be transporting the theory of the Whigs, from the House of Commons to Westminster Hall.

Fourthly, the Edinburgh Reviewers are of opinion, that

'it might, with no small plausibility, be maintained, that, in many countries, there are two classes which, in some degree, answer to this description;' [viz.] 'that the poor compose the class which government is established to restrain; and the people of some property the class to which the powers of government may without danger be confided.'

They take great pains, it is true, to say this and not to say it. They shuffle and creep about, to secure a hole to escape at, if "what they do not assert" should be found in any degree inconvenient. A man might waste his life in trying to find out whether the Misses of the Edinburgh mean to say Yes or No in their political coquetry. But whichever way the lovely spinsters may decide, it is diametrically opposed to history and the evidence of facts, that the poor *are* the class whom there is any difficulty in restraining. It is not the poor but the rich, that have a propensity to take the property of other people. There is no instance upon earth, of the poor having combined to take away the property of the rich; and all the instances habitually brought forward as examples of it, are gross misrepresentations, founded upon the most necessary acts of self-defence on the part of the numerous classes. Such a misrepresentation, is the common one of the Agrarian law; which was nothing but an attempt on the part of the Roman people to get back some part of what had been taken from them by undisguised robbery. Such another is the stock example of the French Revolution, appealed to by the Edinburgh Review in the actual case. It is utterly untrue that the French Revolution took place because 'the poor began to compare their cottages and sallads with the hotels and banquets of the rich;' it took place because they were robbed of their cottages and sallads to support the hotels and banquets of their oppressors. It is utterly untrue that there was either a scramble for property or a general confiscation; the classes who took part with the foreign invader lost their property, as they would have done here, and ought to do everywhere. All these are the vulgar errors of the man on the lion's back,—which the lion will set to rights when he can tell his own story. History is nothing but the relation of the sufferings of the poor from the rich; except precisely so far as the numerous classes of the community have contrived to keep the virtual power in their hands, or in other words, to establish free governments. If a poor man injures the rich, the law is instantly at his heels; the injuries of the rich towards the poor are always inflicted *by* the law. And to enable the rich to do this to any extent that may be practicable or prudent, there is clearly only one postulate wanted, which is, that the rich shall make the law.

This appears to be sufficient, for the Edinburgh Review, in this place. A more useful and agreeable office remains, in endeavouring to give the history of the common-sense principle of morals and politics, and to promote its diffusion.

The first time the phrase of "the principle of utility" was

brought decidedly into notice, was in the 'Essays, by David Hume,' published about the year 1742. In that work it is mentioned as the name of a principle which might be made the foundation of a system of morals, in opposition to a system then in vogue, which was founded on what was called the 'moral sense.' The ideas, however, there attached to it, are vague, and defective in practical application.

Nearly at the same time appeared in French the celebrated work of Helvetius '*Sur l'Esprit.*' In this a commencement was made, of the application of the principle to practical use. A connection was established between the ideas attached to the word "happiness," and those attached to the words "pleasure" and "pain:" by which a great advance was made in the developement of the meaning of the terms "utility" and "principle of utility."

In 1749 appeared the work of David Hartley known by the title of 'Hartley on Man.' It at first consisted of two volumes octavo; which by the abridgements of Dr. Priestley were afterwards reduced to one. In this a greater number of species were ranked under the two heads of pleasure and pain, than in the work of Helvetius; but the collection was still exceedingly defective.

In the year 1768 appeared a pamphlet of Dr. Priestley's, written, as was his custom, in a hasty manner, and with little precise method; but containing in one of its pages the express phrase 'the greatest happiness of the greatest number.' And this was represented as a principle containing the only rational foundation of rules for human conduct.

In the same year this pamphlet fell into the hands of Mr. Bentham at Oxford; he being at that time not quite twenty-one years of age. Like Archimedes on the discovery of the principle of hydrostatics, he exclaimed Εὕρηκα, and from that page of that pamphlet, was drawn the phrase, the import of which it has been the object of his subsequent writings to diffuse.

In 1776 came out Mr. Bentham's first publication, entitled 'A Fragment on Government.' In this he employed the phrase of Priestley's which had made so strong an impression on his mind; and endeavoured to enforce its reception as the radical principle of government, in preference to the fiction of Locke denominated 'the original contract.' In 1781 was begun the printing of his 'Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation;' but it was not till 1789 that it was brought into the state in which it now appears. In this was seen the first inventory that had been attempted, of the differ-

ent forms of stimulus to human action called 'motives;' each motive being accompanied by a reference to the corresponding pleasure or pain, in the prospect of which it has its origin.

In 1817 appeared his tract entitled 'Springs of Action;' which is composed of a pretty extensive Table, elucidated by notes. In this was added for the first time a list of 'interests;' each interest being referred to its corresponding motive, as the motives were to pleasures or to pains.

In the course of the construction of this Table, occasion was given for observing the expression of approbation or the contrary, which in the case of almost every species of motive, is introduced into its designation, according to the colouring desired to be given to it by the speaker. Hence in most cases there were found to be three sorts of designations; one in which the expression of approbation was superadded; another, in which there was the expression of disapprobation; and a third, which presented the original idea without either. The extent to which these kinds of adjuncts were employed as instruments of deception, induced the author of the Table to mark the difference between the classes by appropriate denominations. The terms chosen by him for the two classes which depart in opposite directions from the unadulterated idea, were *eulogistic*, or if preferred, approbative,—and its Greek opposite *dyslogistic*, or if preferred, disapprobative. All new terms have a portion of stiffness; but the proof of their goodness, is the degree in which they finally wind themselves into the practice of mankind. On this ground, there are appearances, that the Greek terms here mentioned, possess a force and spirit, at least to Grecian ears, that will confer on them the durability the Roman emperor complained of being unable to bestow.

On his entrance upon the *moral* (including the *political*) branch of science as it then existed, it appeared to him to be in nearly the same condition as that in which Lord Bacon found the *physical*. The matter of what was called the science, was composed of a more or less copious assemblage of words; and the instruction attempted, consisted principally in conveying information of the relation borne by the import of one of these words to the import of another,—but with an almost total absence of any endeavour to trace the relations of the things typified to each other in the way of cause and effect. Hence, as "*Fiat experimentum*" was the aphorism of Bacon, so "*Fiat observatio*" seemed to be the aphorism demanded in the present case. An Imperial dilettante, or a Colonial Secretary, may be able to pursue his studies by making original experiments upon mankind. But unofficial philosophers must be content to

classify appearances as they arise; without attempting to direct the course of their succession.

In proceeding to make trial of the application of the new principle, it was in the first instance very open to observation, that by far the greatest part of what is done in the way of legislation, is done by making a choice of evils. No government can be without coercion; and the degree in which its ends can be obtained by reward, is so comparatively small, that it may almost be left out of consideration altogether. But if the object of government is to effect an end by means of pains, there appeared strong *primâ facie* reason for believing, that the object of a *good* government must be to prevent a greater evil at the expense of a less; and this led rapidly to a vague surmise,—a wandering suspicion mixed with hope, like 'love's youngest dream,'—that the object of good government might possibly be the carrying the diminution of evil, or the increase of happiness, to its *maximum*. This was the vision of which the prophet caught a glance from his Pisgah, and straightway girded himself to enter on the promised land.

And here was to be encountered in the outset the perplexing question, of *why* the production of the maximum of happiness ought to be the object of government. One possible response was, that it is the production of good. But why ought a government to follow after the production of good?—for to say that it cannot be a good government without it, is at best only an identical proposition. Cicero would have answered that it was because it was virtuous, becoming, or perhaps god-like; and philosopher Square would have said, it was because it was according to the fitness of things. But these are all reasons *à l'antique;* and would not in this day content a Mechanics' Institute. Something might perhaps be done towards an answer, by Euclid's mode improperly included under the title of *reductio ad absurdum*, or defying anybody to prove that the object of government should be anything else. For if it is anything else, the object must be the production of a smaller quantity of good instead of a greater; or in other words, the production of relative evil,—which is an unmaintainable proposition *s'il y en avait jamais*. But the real answer appeared to be, that men at large *ought* not to allow a government to afflict them with more evil or less good, than they can help. What a *government* ought to do, is a mysterious and searching question, which those may answer who know what it means; but what other men ought to do, is a question of no mystery at all. The word *ought*, if it means anything, must have reference to some kind of interest or motives; and what interest a

government has in doing right, when it happens to be interested in doing wrong, is a question for the school-men. The fact appears to be, that *ought* is not predicable of governments. The question is not why governments are bound not to do this or that, but why other men should let them if they can help it. The point is not to determine why the lion should not eat sheep, but why men should eat their own mutton if they can.

It might, perhaps, be objected in this place, that the obligation may be solved into the fact, that men would not consent to obey a government that acted on the principle of diminishing the possible quantity of happiness, and therefore the members of the government are interested in preventing their own overthrow. But the misfortune is, that this solution does not extend to the most needful case; which is that of the successful establishment of an open and avowed diminution of human happiness by the exercise of government. The system of Colonial Slavery, is an overt instance of this kind; but still it is not overthrown. The danger of overthrow, therefore, is not a competent answer to the question " Why the aggregate of human happiness should not be diminished by law in the West Indies."

The only rivals of any note to the new principle which were brough tforward, were those known by the names of the " moral sense," and the " original contract." The new principle superseded the first of these, by presenting it with a guide for its decisions; and the other, by making it unnecessary to resort to a remote and imaginary contract, for what was clearly the business of every man and every hour. Throughout the whole horizon of morals and of politics, the consequences were glorious and vast. It might be said without danger of exaggeration, that they who sat in darkness had seen a great light. The mists in which mankind had jousted against each other were swept away, as when the sun of astronomical science arose in the full developement of the principle of Gravitation. If the object of legislation was the greatest happiness, *Morality* was the promotion of the same end by the conduct of the individual; and by analogy, the happiness of the world was the Morality of nations. The awful names of Justice and Liberty, —which men had long felt after, if haply they might comprehend them,—ceased to designate unknown powers; and *Justice* stood forth as the rule of appropriation which produced the greatest happiness, while *Liberty* was the being subject to no restraints except what were necessary for the promotion of the same end. *Rights*, were what by the same rule men *ought* to have; not the miserable technicality, of what laws and lawyers might have left them. Or if preferred, they were

the securities which individuals could not be unprovided with, without a diminution of the aggregate of happiness. Rights, therefore, in this sense, were no more abrogated by the absence of enjoyment, than Moral rules are abrogated by the absence of obedience; and in this sense it was, that men had murmured of their *Natural* and *Imprescriptible* rights. What men *ought* to have,—that is, what it is for the advancement of the aggregate happiness that they should have,—depends neither on lawyers nor on kings, but on the constitution of things imprinted by the Maker; and is consequently immutable like that. *Equality*, meant equality in the safety of such rights as the rule of the greatest happiness assigned; and it was an easy inference from practical observation, that in the case of all the most important rights, the assignment was uniform to all mankind. The *Sovereignty of the People*, meant the acknowledgment of the essential right of the community to obtain its own happiness in its own way; and a *Constitution*, meant a reserved rule or rules, which in the exercise of this sovereignty it was not committed to the delegated rulers to infringe. A *Legitimate* government, was such a government as was established or assented to by the community, in the uncontrolled exercise of its last-mentioned right; and the *Illegitimate*, were all besides. A *Free* government, was one which not only was legitimate, but in which the members of the community actually exercised an effective portion of the direction of their own concerns, either by the means of representatives or otherwise; and in proportion to the degree in which this exercise was extended and secured, was the degree in which freedom could be predicated of the result. A *Constitutional* government was one in which there was an acknowledgment of the reserved rule or rules denominated a Constitution; a necessary ingredient of a free government, but not identical in terms. Lastly, a glimpse had been received from beyond the Atlantic, of the possibility of such an institution as a *Constitutional Majority*, or committing the charge of alterations in the Constitution itself, to (for instance) a threefold majority of the ordinary delegates, as a provision in the last resort, for what of change may be demanded by the imperfection of human foresight and the flow of time. All the sublime obscurities, which had haunted the mind of man from the first formation of society,—the phantoms whose steps had been on earth, and their heads among the clouds,—marshalled themselves at the sound of this new principle of connexion and of union, and stood a regulated band, where all was order, symmetry, and force. What men had struggled for and bled, while they saw it but as through a glass darkly,—was made the object of substantial

knowledge and lively apprehension. The bones of sages and of patriots stirred within their tombs, that what they dimly saw and followed, had become the world's common heritage. And the great result was wrought by no supernatural means, nor produced by any unparallelable concatenation of events. It was foretold by no oracles, and ushered by no portents; but was brought about by the quiet and reiterated exercise of God's first gift of common sense. Even religions bowed before the discovered rule; and the reason why the divine origin of the Koran and the Vedas was to be disallowed, was because they could not endure the test, which heaven in the exercise of its simpler providence had revealed to human apprehension. Fanatics and bigots might frown; but good men of all creeds hailed the appearance of peace on earth and good-will towards men, in the establishment of the principle which made human happiness, the end of all studies, and the land-mark of all toils.

Subordinate to the greater results of the discovery, were many other inferences both in morals and in politics. The innumerable questions which had been agitated concerning the merit or demerit of certain actions, were now found to be decided by a rule perfectly within the reach of human application, and which exhibited itself as a rigid touchstone of other systems. The paradox of the Stoics was dissolved by simple transposition; and instead of virtue making happiness, what makes the general happiness was virtue. But it was in the relations which pass under the name of the political, that its agency was most decisive. If the happiness of men was the object of government, it was plain that this object was to be obtained by their being governed with a view to their own interests, and not to the interest of somebody else. And the way to effect this, was that they should govern *themselves*, or which amounts to the same thing in the view proposed, should hold an effectual check over those to whom the reins of government are committed. That a community of any great extent should govern by the constant act and deed of all its members, was as palpably inconvenient, amounting to the impracticable, as that the owner of a large fortune should be his own steward, butler, groom, huntsman, coachman, all in one. But it no more followed in one case than in the other, that the impracticability of exercising these offices except by delegate, derogates from the complete and perfect right to superintend their exercise by others. The sovereignty of the community, like that of the rich proprietor over his corks and his curry-combs, is an essential, not an active sovereignty. It is a sovereignty which can only be well exercised by delegating its execution

to others under rules; but it is not on that account less real or less solid.

But if the community is to hold an effectual check over those who are to govern for it, the government, or at all events some integral and indispensable branch of it, must be committed to individuals chosen by the community at large or by its subdivisions. The Whigs say not,—and that it should be committed to somebody else, meaning themselves; and on this they and the community are at issue. And here rises to view the greatest political invention of the moderns; which is the system of Representation. And the plain and simple *rationale* of the right of Representation, unembarrassed with the consideration of what it may be one dishonest man's interest to defend or another's to acquire, is that all should be admitted equally, and that when all are so admitted and not before, each man possesses the full enjoyment of all the influence his wealth, talents, or reputation, can confer on him without infringing on the happiness of others. The principle of this is as clear, as that of the right of equal admission to the market. The equality of admission, does not make men possess an equality of influence when they are there. On the contrary it is precisely then, that the rich man has the just advantage of the influence, which there is no intention to deny him. The fallacy is in stating, that the rich cannot have their proper influence in the market, unless the poor are kept out besides. Property should be represented; but then it should be everybody's property; the fallacy is, that it should be only the property of those who happen to have a great deal. And as in the common market, so in the greater market of election. In such a contest of interests, every man's influence would fetch exactly what it was worth; and the theory which claims for the rich not only the influence of their riches, but the exclusion of the poor besides, is as visibly and demonstrably unjust, as in the market case produced as parallel. This furnishes the foundation of the right of *Universal Suffrage;* a right which no reasonable man that understands it will ever consent to disavow, however remote the actual condition of society may be from its practical enjoyment. To think common sense at home, is a luxury that might have been indulged in in Egypt; even though all the surrounding world worshipped a crocodile or a monkey. Closely connected with the *universality* of suffrage, is the opportunity of its frequent exercise. For the only practical way of preserving a check over those appointed to the directorship of the great Company, is to send them back to their constituents frequently; and the more frequent the reference, the more perfect the check. And the period which

would occur to every man who had no sinister interests to promote, would be that it should be *annual.* The organ of the Whigs once undertook to ask, why the period should be precisely a year, and what virtue there was in a planet's periodic time, that should connect it with a seat in parliament. To which the answer is by asking, why men do other things yearly, and not, for instance, every eighteen months. Why do men make up their accounts once a year, hold Long Vacations once a year, keep their birth-days once a year, visit their friends once a year, physic and purge, eat mince-pies, issue Army-lists and the Red Book, and take the sacrament by Act of Parliament, —if it is not that the necessary connexion of the seasons with many of the acts of man, makes it highly convenient for him to bind up his other actions in the same routine, and hence in all things that require regularity of performance, his option is in reality to do them once a year, or once in two. But between these, there is a gulph, which passed, leads easily to once in seven, or once in ten. The tradesman who should defer making up his accounts to a second year, would soon bring them to a conclusion in the Fleet; and if all the members of the community had as lively a sense of their interest as the tenant of a chandler's shop, they would be equally jealous of the laxity of delay. Sensible men make their stand upon the right side of the gulph; and fools upon the other.

On these two important points of Universal Suffrage and its Annual exercise, the objections oftenest urged relate to some impracticability or difficulty to arise in the execution. On which it may be answered, that if an intelligent committee was appointed, with instructions to devise the mode in which the greatest obstacles should be thrown in the way of the quiet exercise of the operation of appointing representatives, it would clearly devise the actual one. In the first place, it is plain, that it would advise the compression of the power of choice into the hands of a few; that there might be a physical possibility of the few being bribed. Secondly, it would recommend the extension of the period of service; in order that it might be better worth while for the candidates to bribe, and that the electors might be enabled to indulge in riot on an occasion that occurs but seldom, in a way they could not do if it occurred more frequently. Thirdly and lastly, it would suggest that each man's way of voting should be published, in order that the greatest possible scope might be given to the operation of party feelings, and no man be able to escape by holding his peace. This is what a sensible committee would recommend; and, by consequence, it is what sensible men on the other side would recommend to be undone. It is evident at sight, that

the difficulties suggested are not only factitious and artificial, but require great pains to secure and keep them in existence. It would be as much easier to take men's votes annually than septennially, as for a boy to comb his hair daily than once a week,—if the management was in the hands of those who had an interest in its success. And the votes of an entire population might be taken with as much facility as a census, if the way that leads to such a result was followed, instead of the way that does not. When the lion builds its own cage, interests hostile to the good of the community will pare their own claws. But whether their claws are pared or not, it is satisfactory to know what arrangements are directed to the good of the community, and what are curiously and scientifically adjusted to its opposite.

These are the principles against which the Whigs have directed the small battery of their wit; which was more than it was politic to do, upon the strength of 'past renown and antiquated power.' Among other specimens of their ingenuity, they think they embarrass the subject, by asking why, on the principles in question, women should not have votes as well as men. *And why not?*—

'Gentle shepherd, tell me why.'—

If the mode of election was what it ought to be, there would be no more difficulty in women voting for a representative in parliament, than for a director at the India House. The world will find out at some time, that the readiest way to secure justice on some points, is to be just on all;—that the whole is easier to accomplish than the part;—and that whenever the camel is driven through the eye of the needle, it would be simple folly and debility that would leave a hoof behind.

Another of their perverted ingenuities is, that 'they are rather inclined to think,' that it would, on the whole, be for the interest of the majority to plunder the rich; and if so, the Utilitarians will say, that the rich *ought* to be plundered. On which it is sufficient to reply, that for the majority to plunder the rich, would amount to a declaration that nobody should be rich; which, as all men wish to be rich, would involve a suicide of hope. And as nobody has shown a fragment of reason why such a proceeding should be for the general happiness, it does not follow that the "Utilitarians" would recommend it. The Edinburgh Reviewers have a waiting gentlewoman's ideas of Utilitarianism. It is unsupported by anything but the pitiable "We are rather inclined to think,"—and is utterly contradicted by the whole course of history and human experience besides,—that there is either danger or possibility of such a

consummation as the majority agreeing on the plunder of the rich. There have been instances in human memory, of their agreeing to plunder rich oppressors, rich traitors, rich enemies, —but the rich *simpliciter*, never. It is as true now as in the days of Harrington, that " a people never will, nor ever can, never did, nor ever shall, take up arms for levelling." All the commotions in the world have been for something else: and " levelling" is brought forward as the blind, to conceal what the other was.

The real errors of the author of the " Essays," may be concluded under the lawyer-like mistake, of pouncing on the technical and secondary meaning of terms, to the exclusion of the primary. As lawyers and law-makers became anxious to secure the adherence of mankind to their decisions, they found a strong interest in representing that *their law* was right, and right was *their law*. They were not only to be the servants of Astræa, but they were to be Astræa herself. Hence they applied themselves to suppress all reference to the awful though obscure ideas which men possessed, of a power to which both law and lawyers were meant to be subservient; the object being to transfer to themselves the reverence intended for the other. The only wonder is, that when they went to the secondary sense, they did not go to the ternary, and declare that the word justice meant nothing but a justice of the peace. With deference, however, to their authority, the original sense of words exists as ever; and " seeking justice and doing right," *does not* mean seeking Coke and doing Blackstone.

But as all knowledge is only the accumulation of improvements, the very title of the principle in question was found susceptible of progressive amelioration. Its first name, " the Principle of Utility," was defective in as much as it did not express the nature and extent of the utility intended; and the same objection extended to the terms " Utilitarian" and " Utilitarianism." It may be useful to a thief to steal; but it is useful to the community at large, that men should not steal; and it was this last utility, and not the first, which was intended, but not expressed. Its next denomination was, the principle of " the Greatest Happiness of the Greatest Number." This was erroneous by superfluity; and was in fact attempting to say the same thing twice instead of once. Though nothing in the writings of any of the proposers supported such a construction, it was liable to be represented as maintaining, that if, for example, a nation was composed of a million of black men and a million and one of white, the white were justified in sacrificing as much as they pleased of the happiness of the million, for the sake of any increase that might be made

to the happiness of the million and one. The latest improvement, therefore, of the philosopher whose long life has been dedicated to the diffusion of the principle,—and of which the present Article has to boast of being the announcement and the organ,—is to dismiss the superfluous 'greatest number,' and declare that the just object of politics and morals, is simply "THE GREATEST HAPPINESS." In this manner the magnificent proposition emerges clearly, and disentangled from its accessary. And the accessary proposition is, that the greatest aggregate of happiness must always include the happiness of the greatest number. For the greatest number must always be composed of those who individually possess a comparatively small portion of the good things of life; and if anything is taken from one of these to give to the others, it is plain that what he loses in happiness, is greater than what the others gain. It is the mathematical assertion, that a quantity x is greater in comparison of a small quantity it is taken from, than of a large one it is added to. It is the avowal that half-a-crown is of more consequence to the porter who loses it, than to the Duke of Bedford who should chance to find it;—that a chief portion of the baseness of the rich man who seized the poor's ewe lamb, consisted in taking what caused so much greater pain to the sufferer, than happiness to the receiver.

It would clearly be very desirable to compress the expression of "The Principle of the greatest Aggregate of Happiness," or its conjugates, into a single term. Those who object indiscriminately to inventions in nomenclature, are either ignorant of their power, or jealous of their effect. It is, however, very difficult to combine the three ideas of "greatest, aggregate, and happiness," in a single word. What friendly efforts have failed to effect, the scorner has perhaps supplied. That name is best, which most strongly excites in the minds of friends and enemies, the impressions designed to be conveyed. It has always been permitted, to learn from an opponent. The Utilitarians shall abandon foreign titles, and "the sacred language of the *Benthamites*" be all that shall be heard of by posterity.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 October, 1829.

ART. I.—1. *Trial and Condemnation of Esther Hibner.* From the Morning Chronicle of April 11, 1829.

2. *Despatch of Mr. Secretary Huskisson to the Governor of the Bahamas, on the Subject of the Cruelties perpetrated by Henry and Helen Moss on a Female Negro Slave who died under the inflic-*

tion, and the Application for Remission of their Punishment. Dated Downing Street, Sept. 28, 1827. From the Anti-Slavery Monthly Reporter for April, 1829.

HISTORY tells of an individual, who believed he had travelled for seven years in foreign countries and there done many notable acts, when the truth was that he had dipped his head into a pail of water and taken it out again. Very much like this is the history of that metaphorical personage, the type of all that is foolish and deceivable in nations, in whom under one bestial appellation is concentrated the description of the ignorance and *gullibility* of the British community. Believing himself to be wise, it is impossible to tell the time when he became a fool. He said, "I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing; and knew not that he was wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked." Puffed up with the idea that he was something and somebody, he winked and ran his head quietly into the endurance of such frauds, as could never have befallen anybody that was in the habit of walking with his eyes open, or was humble enough to conceive that he might possibly be made a dupe.

Not that the man positively would not take his fingers out of the fire when they were burning. On the contrary, nobody made more turmoil when he knew that he was hurt. But his coat might be taken off his back, by anybody that would tell him a long story. He was a man of *one* idea, or at most, of *two;* but it was only necessary to go as far as *three*, to leave him in utter bewilderment. For example, he knew well enough, that he did not like to be robbed and murdered himself. This was idea Number One; and it is supposed that he had as clear a comprehension of it, as mathematicians have of Euclid. He had a glimmering too, that it was not for his interest, that people should be robbed and murdered somewhere else; provided it was in a neighbouring parish, or at all events in some parish where he apprehended a distant possibility that he might be murdered himself. But if it was further off than this, the question was too much for him. It was the triple idea which he could never comprehend, that he could have anything to do with felony, where he never intended to adventure his own person. If an injury was done to himself, or to any person within the degree of third cousin, there was nobody that made a more exemplary bawling for the constable. When a woman in his own neighbourhood had "whipt two female 'prentices to death, and hid them in the coal-hole," he thought hanging was too good for her; and there he stood, when the miserable wretch was brought out to just and necessary punish-

ment,—trying to overwhelm her sinful soul with more than dying horror, by adding at that fearful moment the expression of his unforgiveness and his hate. But when the same thing was done in a parish a little further off,—and that not by accident, but as part and parcel of a system which the whole parish, with their overseers at their head, had risen up to defend,—he quietly went home, *and paid a tax to enable the like to be done again.* He grumbled much of the hardness of times, and the difficulty an honest man had to live; but not one word did he say against the imposition of a poll-tax to enable the Esther Hibners of the West Indies to ride, not in a cart, but in their coaches. On the contrary, he went home, and called his wife and children, and after asking if they had said their prayers, he said to them, "I have seen a woman hanged this morning. I was never so pleased in my life. And now send for some sugar for breakfast; and when you pay eleven-pence for the sugar, take care that you pay the penny for the West-Indians." It never occurred to him or his gaping brood,—though, to say the truth, they were well-intentioned persons enough in their way,—that *their* representatives and everybody's representatives, were taxing them and everybody, not for any benefit that was to arise to them or the community, but simply that the proceeds of this taxation might find their way into the pockets of such persons, as, in their own parish, they thought hanging was too good for. It was quite certain that these persons, and all the mischief and misery attendant on their system, existed solely because the people of Great Britain were taxed to pay for it, and could not exist without it. They were as clearly raised, supported, and kept in existence by a rate laid upon the people of Great Britain, as a poor-house or a county hospital. They could not pay for their whip-leather, unless an extra tax was laid on the produce of other British possessions, for the purpose of obliging the British consumer to put the difference into the pockets of the West-Indians. The people of Great Britain, in fact,—the same people who give themselves airs when they get into foreign parts, by reason of their freedom,—pay a poll-tax for the support of slavery and slave-owners in the West Indies. But all this, the simple man and his brood would never have found out to their dying day. He would have been shocked if he had been asked to contribute to the maintenance of a receiver of stolen goods in his own street. If the parish officer had come to intimate to him, that his wife and daughters were to be rated, to rebuild the houses of ill fame that were lately burnt at Temple Bar, all his reverence for the authorities would not have prevented him from knocking him down. But when he

was to pay for the same kind of thing by instalments upon every piece of sugar the same wife and daughters put into their mouths; it was quite beyond him to find out, of his own pure brain, that there was anything degrading in the affair. In short, he would have paid for a fire to roast his own father, and salt to eat him with, if it had only been put to him in the shape of a duty on faggots, or an exciseman in the salt-box.

There is not one word of jest or exaggeration in all this. It is a plain unadorned statement of what is taking place with every Englishman at every hour. The English people, high and low, hate slavery and injustice as much as anybody does. They have had their hours of struggle, which have taught them *why* they hate them; and the issue of the contest has left them, in many respects, the foremost of the world in the general march of liberty and civilization. But they pay a poll-tax for no reason on earth but that the abettors of slavery in their colonies may have whips instead of no whips. They suffer themselves to be basely bullied,—or more properly, past ministries, from inward affection to the bad cause, have suffered themselves to be basely bullied as their representatives,—by men whom they are at the very moment paying to support. They allow the slave-drivers in the West Indies to shake their hardened fists in every British face,—and their agents in this country to cover with ribald abuse every honest man and woman who raises a voice in opposition,—and all the while they are positively paying a penny in the shilling on all the sugar they eat, for no reason on earth but that the thing they hate may be carried on, and because it could not be carried on without it. If the West-Indian islands with all their abominations were to sink into the sea to-morrow, the British people instead of being losers, would be immense gainers. They would be the gainers of all they now pay in the shape of taxation for their support; which only goes to keep coaches for the agents of the injustice, and buy boroughs to enable them to support their cause in parliament. The whole "West-Indian body" as they call themselves, is nothing but one large fraud. Everything is a fraud which supports one set of men upon the earnings of another. It is a robbery on a large scale upon the people of England; who are plundered of the earnings of their labour, and in return have the pleasure of seeing the "West-Indian body" living upon their money. That this is true, is proved by the fact, that the whole West-Indian system together, cannot be carried on without being supported by a tax. Whip as he will, the slave-driver does not make both ends meet, till the people of England are taxed to pay the difference. They must be made to pay ten per cent more for sugar than it can

be got for in the East Indies or other places; and then ten per cent finds its way into the West-Indian's pocket. It is clearly all a cheat, as much as ring-dropping. Out of nothing, nothing can come; and where men cannot get rich unless the people of England raise it for them by subscription, it is mere trick and legerdemain to point to their riches as increasing wealth. If part of the money finds its way into the hands of government in the shape of further taxation, the real nature of the transaction is only like a government's proposing to get rich by levying a contribution on the gains of highwaymen. The tax and the unjust gain of which it is a part, can only be taken from some honest man to begin with; which can make no gain in the aggregate. If ships and sailors are employed in the dishonest trade, they would also be employed in the honest trade as much. There would be just as much shipping employed in bringing home honest sugar, as sugar which the people is robbed to pay for. No man denies, or pretends to deny, the truth of all this. No man, with common regard for his own cause, will put down an assertion to the contrary on paper, which shall give an opportunity of displaying its fallacy piece-meal.

The colonists are in the habit of blustering about their "property," and their "vested rights." God knows what term of possession may give these men a right to a sanguinary wrong. But in his mercy he has made a nearer way; he has not left us to be troubled with the question. Do the West-Indians set up any claim to *our* property? Do they advance any right to make *us* subscribe for the flogging of women in Jamaica? Is the House of Commons bound to impose such taxes for the support of slavery, "*as the planters will sanction**"? If not, then the West-Indians have overshot their mark. They have bullied and insulted an honest and a generous people; where their only chance for existence lay in conciliation and submission. They have talked loud of what they would do, and what they would not do; forgetting that all the time they hung by the mere thread of the volition of the English people, for doing anything or being anything. Ministers, too, have existed, mean enough to play into the hands of the originators of the fraud, and to speak as if there really was some difficulty in making the colonists accede to any terms the British government should intimate; knowing all the time that they exist only by the fiat of the government operating in the shape of exactions on the people. If the West-Indians are unmanage-

* 'With regard to the Sugar Colonies, settle the slave question in such a manner as the planters will sanction.'—*Blackwood's Ed. Mag. July*, 1829, p. 115.

able, *stop their rations*. If they can keep themselves, let them take their own way, like other people that can keep themselves. But if they cannot, then let them, like other paupers, submit to the directions of those that pay for them; and do not let *us* be troubled with the insolence and bad propensities of the great poor-house in the Antilles. If Helen Moss is to be supported by a rate upon the parish, Helen Moss shall be quiet, and have neither slaves nor apprentices to flog; or else Helen Moss shall be put on low diet, till she finds the difference between rubbing pepper into girls' eyes in the West Indies, and being insolent to honest men in England who are paying for her keep*.

* *Extract from the Speech of Sir James Macintosh in the House of Commons, June 3, 1829. From the Anti-Slavery Monthly Reporter for June*, 1829.—'The Hon. Member [Mr. H. Gurney] had had recourse to a species of argument respecting the case of the Mosses, which he remembered was used at the beginning of the debates on the proposed abolition of the slave trade. A great West India proprietor said, on the occasion to which he had alluded, that the House might as well judge of the morals of England by the records of the Old Bailey, as judge of the character of the West India planters from a few occurrences selected for the purpose of making an unfavourable impression on the public. To this Mr. Fox replied—"I do not wonder that the slave trade should remind the Hon. Gentleman of the Old Bailey. Nothing can be so congenial as the two subjects. Nevertheless I will point out to the Hon. Gentleman a contrast between them. At the Old Bailey we hear of crimes which shock our moral feelings; but we are consoled by the punishment of the criminals. We read of crimes as atrocious in the West India islands, but our moral feelings are shocked at hearing not only of the impunity of the criminals, but of their triumph." In adverting to the case of the Mosses, the Hon. Member had, most unfortunately for his argument, alluded to the case of Mrs. Hibner. The contrast which these cases presented between the moral feeling of the Bahamas and the moral feeling of this country was much more striking than the contrast to which Mr. Fox had formerly called the attention of the House. The offenders in the Bahamas having not only committed a murder, but committed it in the most barbarous manner possible, had been condemned to five months' imprisonment. What followed? A memorial had been presented to the Colonial Secretary, signed by what were called the most respectable persons in the colony, attesting that the character of these cruel murderers was generally one of great humanity, and praying for a remission of their punishment. That was the manner in which this atrocious crime was viewed in an island, the inhabitants of which were in no other way demoralized than as the possession of unbounded and irresponsible power always corrupted the heart of man. Nay more, a public dinner, as a matter of triumph, was actually given, by the chief persons in the colony, to the criminals who had barely escaped the most condign punishment for their offences. What was, on the other hand, the case in London when a criminal of the lowest order, this same Mrs. Hibner, whose crime was not aggravated by the consideration that she was possessed of information which ought to have taught her better, committed a similar offence? He was not the apologist of the vindictive feeling exhibited by the populace on the occasion; but it was well known that they departed from the humanity which they usually exhibited towards the unfortunate persons who underwent the last sentence of the law. They could not conceal their horror at a crime, which, however, was far less atrocious than that which had been committed by the *respectable* Mosses; and even rent the air with shouts of triumph when they witnessed the payment of the dreadful penalty. In justice, however, to the people of London, he must observe, that he remembered only three instances in which they had thus deviated from their usual feelings of commiseration for suffering criminals, and those were all

The pretext might have done for the days of ignorance; but, no minister in the present time would risk his credit, by intimating the existence of a difficulty in bringing the West-Indians to any terms, which the government acting on behalf of the British community should be pleased to propose. A minister who should do so now, would be hooted down,—out of the House if not in the House,—as a man that had voluntarily come forward with a fraud in his hand and a falsehood in his mouth. If any minister has a reason to offer, why the people of England should continue to pay a duty of 10*s.* a hundredweight on sugar from their East-Indian colonies in order that slavery may be paid for in the West, let him produce it; but if he loves his credit for common penetration and ordinary prudence, let him not risk the assertion that there is any difficulty in the removal of the slavery.

What a minister desirous to do justice to the people of England would manifestly do, would be to remove the extra duties in favour of West-Indian sugar, by a prospective act, to take effect six months after date; and then intimate to the blustering paupers of the West Indies, that when the colonial legislatures had enacted and effectually put into execution every jot and tittle of what should be intimated to them from the government at home, the government at home would consider how far they would propose to the people of England the taking them again upon the paupers' list, and what portion of the labour of Englishmen should, upon sincere repentance and most abject and unreserved submission for past misconduct, be permitted to dribble into the pockets of the penitents. This is what every minister knows to be common sense and common honour; and there is nothing in the constitution of the present leaders of the country, to make it probable that they have any disinclination to act upon the knowledge.

In the present state of public information, it would be absurd for a minister to attempt to put forward the occupation of the West-Indian islands as a source of national wealth, when it is notorious that the whole establishment is maintained only by an impost on the public. There may have been a time when the wealth, the glories, the military and naval power which make their appearance on certain points in consequence of the retention of the West Indies, might have been advanced, and nobody have found out that they were all paid for by a greater diminution of wealth and power somewhere else. But "*the people*

---

cases in which the punishment of death had been inflicted for the crime of murder, accompanied with circumstances of peculiar cruelty. Thus, even in their errors, the generosity which belonged to their general character was strongly evinced.'

are over-eaucated" for such an imposition now. The friends of slavery in the House of Commons should have stopped the progress of *A*, *B*, *C*, long ago; and as they did not, they must take the consequences. The West-Indians have sometimes threatened to transfer their allegiance to America. If the Americans would take them on such terms, it would be policy for Great Britain to offer the Americans a million sterling a-year to consent to the arrangement, and she would be a great gainer by the bargain after all. A collection of paupers who should utter a threat that they would quit the parish, would not be half so welcome to put their threats in execution. The people of England are tired of the West-Indians. They are tired, in the first place, of keeping them by public contribution; and they are tired of the insolence with which their misplaced charity has been returned.

Suppose the owner of a beast of burthen were to disgust the public by the exhibition of base and malignant cruelty,—as for instance, that he were seen beating it to death, and rubbing pepper into its eyes, as the ladies who are kept out of our money in the West Indies do to their slaves;—and that on being interfered with by the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, or by anybody else, he should harangue upon his right of property, and turn upon the interferers with injury and insult. And suppose that after all it should be found out, that the very people whom he was bespattering, were subscribing to find him the means by which he possessed himself of the animal in question;—that in fact he had not the means of livelihood, except by the contributions of the people he was insulting. How small would be the chance of such a ruffian, for the continuation of his nuisance; and how crawling and utterly contemptible would be the advisers, who should suggest the slightest difficulty in putting down his mal-practices. Perhaps such a man might threaten, that if he was interfered with, he would starve his victim altogether. Try him. Depend upon it there will be no danger. He will be as supple as a glove. The moment he is touched on the right place,—the instant he perceives that he is understood and overmatched,—his subserviency will be equal to his former violence. He will be your poor industrious jackass-driver,—he will turn methodist—go to week-day prayers—sing psalms till his voice cracks—do anything that he thinks will tend to effect the prolongation of his pittance. Be assured, that he will be the most pathetic and obliging personage in the creation; his ass shall eat with him, sleep with him, if the gentlemen will be so kind as to think about continuing his half-a-crown a-week. Just such will be the conduct of the people who have insulted us in

the West Indies, if we can only pluck up heart to say a word about the stoppage of the parish pay. They will send a deputation to make an apology to every honest man that has been insulted by their hired press,—and to give every honest woman a shaddock and a mamee-apple for her little boys,—the moment they find themselves threatened with the stoppage of the allowance. Why are the people of England to support men they dislike, and be insulted in return? Why is every man and woman in this country to pay a poll-tax, amounting in the whole to not less than a million and a half a-year; with no earthly return but the pleasure of reading the advertisements in the West-Indian gazettes, and now and then the murder of a missionary by way of *sauce piquante?*

If the slave-owners pretend to deny the character of their system, there would be just as much chance for Esther Hibner to have persuaded the public of the non-entity of her crimes. Putting all individual testimony on one side, their own public acts afford a mass of evidence, which nobody that is not hired pretends to misunderstand. If there has been any softening in their practice, it is only as it has been forced upon them by the humanity of the British community; and the same humanity will force them to an end. If they have abandoned any particular cruelty, they grinned and scowled like Smithfield drovers forbidden to strike below the hock; and when a British minister proposed the abolition of the indecent whipping of women upon the field,—they rose with one consent to say that *this* was their birth-right, and they would die by it;—they could have submitted to any moderate interference from British tyranny, but *this* was a necessary of life, which, if Englishmen would not pay for, the allegiance of the West Indies must be at an end, and "Old England" take the risk, of "doing without Barbadoes." It is as clear as the day, that their system altogether is one which every Englishman, in his own person, knows it would be honour and glory to demolish by the bayonet. Every Englishman knows that the right of resistance to personal slavery, is as clear and distinct a right, as that of resistance to the wild beasts of the forest. If this is not law, there is no law,—it is time for every man to take his musquet if he has one, and be a law unto himself. It is not men meeting together with certain forms, and calling themselves the Honourable *this*, or the Worshipful *that*,—which can legalize what in its own nature is contrary to the purposes for which human society is formed. It is true enough that the tiger may make laws, and define what punishments he will execute on those who shall resist him and fail. But it is not the less true that he *and* his laws, are the enemies of the human race; and that.

no man is bound to obey them longer than he finds himself beneath the paw. If the West-Indians were omnipotent in England to-morrow, they could not make one Englishman acknowledge, that their rule, when applied to himself, was to be endured an hour longer than a bayonet could be got to point in opposition to it. If every man in England could be made hypocrite enough to deny this truth in words, he would not the less believe it in his heart. All honest men, in spirit, drink the great moralist's toast every day of their existence; and if every member of the House of Commons could be induced to exclaim against the impropriety, they would not do it less. Not a soldier or officer is sent to the colonies who does not know, that the only way of reconciling his service with the duty of an honest man or the honour of a gentleman, is by considering himself as the guardian of the great acts of justice which must speedily take place. In any other light, he might as well be invited to patrole Hounslow in aid of the knights of the road, or form a cordon round the houses of the Marrs and the Williamsons, while the man with a hammer did his office inside. There is no use in a government, or any portion of the members of a government, setting themselves up against the acknowledged rules of justice and right on which all the submission of the community to them is dependent. The only consequence is, that so far as they succeed in impressing the public with this opinion of their acts, so far do they lose the benefit of every principle of obedience but fear. It may be *necessary* to obey a government that supports slavery by law; but it can never be *desirable*, longer than it is necessary. There is not one rule of right for a man here, and another somewhere else. The robbery that is detestable at Hounslow, does not become sanctified by degrees of west longitude. And so long as it is authorized any where, the direct inference is, that if men in other places are not subjected to the same treatment, it is only because their own physical force stands between them and the infliction. A government where the people can be taxed to support slavery abroad, and a part of the plunder expended in buying rotten boroughs to support the iniquity at home,—is clearly one that needs a root-and-branch reformation, on the naked principle of self-defence in the community. If governments do not like root-and-branch reformations, they should cut off the gratuitous iniquities which induce the danger; and not give food to the cry for radical reform, for the sake of a dinner to ministers from the "West-Indian body."

The colonists have tried to frighten the government and the country, by holding out the necessity that, in the event of the emancipation of their slaves, they should be paid for them;

and some of the friends of emancipation have been weak enough to show an inclination to admit the principle. Suppose now, that an Irish pauper, in the days when Irishmen worked their horses by the tails, had been interfered with by the parish officers with a view to put an end to his barbarous practice, and had answered "If your honours stop my allowance till I give over working my horse by the tail, I hope you mean to pay me what I gave for him, *and allow me to work him in harness besides.*" This is a fair statement of the West-Indian proposition. Everybody knows, that what they demand to be paid for, is the mere pleasure of working by the tail; it is simply the gratification of those evil lusts and passions, which can be gratified under a system of slavery, and cannot be gratified so well under a system of free labour. What we pay a poll-tax for, is simply that the West-Indians may have the luxury of the whip. We pay for the pleasurable titillation excited in colonial nerves, by the exercise of the constitutional right of the flogging of women. And if we decline paying for this, we are invited, as a point of justice, to lay down the sum that was given for the thing flogged; upon the principle, apparently, that if not flogged, the use intended from it is at an end. The people of England are undeniably very weak upon some points; but it is to be hoped they will never be so weak, as to think of paying for the horse, as the price of working him in harness instead of by the tail.

The claim for payment being demonstrably a fraud, it is plain that an honest minister would have nothing to do but to stop the disgraceful tax endured by the people of this country, till the West-Indian governments comply in the fullest manner with every intimation that should be made to them. Nobody is afraid of ministers going too far; the only difficulty is in raising a force of opinion to make them go far enough. And nobody doubts the desirableness of the alterations being made by the colonial governments, or their superior aptitude for executing them. When, therefore, they have emancipated, or put in a direct course of emancipation within such period as the government should suggest, the whole of their negro population, —it would be quite time enough to think of returning to the poll-tax. By all means let them do it with the deliberation they shall find necessary. Let them reflect well upon the difficulties that are in the way, and do nothing hastily, rashly, or unadvisedly; but, in the mean time, let the people of England be free from the poll-tax.

It would be an insult at this time of day to ask the English people whether slavery is an evil or not; they might just as well be asked the question, of house-breaking. Even the poor

peasant and manufacturer, who are trodden down by the effect of bad laws till their actual mess of pottage is of smaller dimensions than that of the slave in the West Indies, are capable of appreciating the injury of the plea, which tells them that their condition would be improved if they and their children were made saleable like beasts. This is what *would* be done, if their own physical force did not prevent it; so far at least, as depends on those who support the remoter evil. The same hired press that takes the side of slavery in the colonies, would take the side of reducing the working population of England to the same slavery, if any body saw chance enough of effecting the object, to make it worth while to pay. Esther Hibner might have had it on her side, if she could have taken two hundred copies of a Sunday paper weekly. As it is, the slave-owners are content with levying about two shillings annually, from every individual of the starving labourer's family. A good meal once a quarter, is taken from the haggard wife and the starving child; because without it, there would be no possibility of carrying on the flogging of women in the colonies. The object is not to debate whether this is an evil, but to excite men to union and perseverance in abating the nuisance. When suffering men are taxed, the ordinary assumption is, that it is for some benefit that is to arise to the community. But here the object is simply and solely, that bad men may riot in the pleasures of injustice, and that the sixpences abstracted quarterly from the industrious and the poor, may be clubbed together in the shape of carriages and good dinners for the owners of slaves in the West Indies.

There *must* be an end of the system of robbing one man to keep another; and in no place can it so properly begin, as where, in addition to the simple robbery, the whole thing supported is hateful in itself. The time is past when men could be deterred from pursuing such an object, by the apprehension of insult from the defenders of the wrong. Such insults are honours; and there is no individual so mean, as to be unable to aspire to a portion of the credit. The poorest man in England can raise a voice somewhere, against the system which taxes his family by the head, in support of the injustice he has learnt from his forefathers to hate. The pith and marrow of the whole system, lie in the convenience of the higher classes taking the work of the lower without paying for it. The higher classes find it the pleasantest thing in the world to be worked for and not to pay, or to pay only as much as they chuse; and the poor man is to be taxed in his basket and in his store, that what cannot be wrung from the black slave abroad, may be made up by the white one at home.

The people of the West Indies seem to labour under an utter ignorance of the light in which their system altogether is viewed in England. When West-Indian magistrates apply the term "wretch" to a negro who is put to death for having failed in an attempt at resistance,—the people of England do not consider him as a "wretch," but as a good and gallant man, dying in the best of causes, the resistance to oppression, by which themselves hold all the good that they enjoy. They consider him as a soldier fallen in the advance-guard of that combat, which is only kept from themselves, because somebody else is exposed to it further off. If the murdered negro is a "wretch," then an Englishman is a "wretch," for not bowing his head to slavery whenever it invites him. The same reason that makes the white Englishman's resistance virtuous and honourable, makes the black one's too;—it is only a regiment with different facings, fighting in the same cause. Will these men never know the ground on which they stand? Can nothing make them find out, that the universal British people would stand by and cheer on their dusky brethren to the assault, if it was not for the solitary hope that the end may be obtained more effectually by other means? It is not true that the people of England believe, that any set of men, here or any-where, can by any act of theirs alter the nature of slavery, or make that not robbery which was robbery before. They can make it robbery according to law, the more is the pity that the power of law-making should be in such hands; but this is the only inference. All moral respect for such laws,—all submission of the mind, as to a rule which it is desirable to obey and honourable to support,—is as much out of the question, as if a freebooter were to lay down a scale of punishment, for those who should be found guilty of having lifted a hand against his power.

When the question, with what the West-Indians have to answer, has been so long and amply debated by the press in various forms, it would be superfluous to enter into an examination of all the arguments which have been advanced to show, that Englishmen with dark faces should be slaves. The principal ones now insisted on, are two; First, that all the opponents to slavery are hypocrites; and Secondly, that the produce of the other distant possessions of Great Britain (as for instance, East-Indian sugar) is equally raised by the labour of slaves.

Now supposing it were actually true, that every man who takes a prominent part in opposition to the continuance of slavery in the West Indies, was a hypocrite at heart;—that it was the real and veritable fact, that every such man had a colony of his own, where he was only waiting for the abolition

of slavery in the West Indies, to see the "removal of many objections to that system" in his own peculiar establishment; *in what manner would that make it desirable that Englishmen should pay a poll-tax for the support of slavery in the West Indies?* And suppose again it was actually true, which it is not,—that the produce of the East Indies was raised by the labour of slaves as well as of the West;—*in what manner would that make it desirable that the people of England should pay a poll-tax to support the produce of the West?* Supposing they were both villainies alike, what reason would there be for the people of England paying a poll tax, for the sake of supporting one villainy in preference to another villainy? There is nothing like this at the Old Bailey. Nobody pays a poll-tax in order that the receiver of stolen goods in the Minories may flourish in preference to him of Houndsditch. The arguments are no arguments, even when the facts assumed are admitted in their fullest extent; still less when they are utterly false and unfounded. Nobody believes that the dislike to keeping a carriage for Esther Hibner proceeds from hypocrisy. Nobody believes that cultivation is carried on by slaves in the East, as it is in the West. If so, where are the slave-laws, and where are the advertisements in the gazettes? The natives of India, in their own extraordinary English, advertise everything else that can possibly be bought or sold; how is it that they never advertise slaves? There is not a common soldier that arrives from India, that is not capable of bearing testimony to the flagrant falsehood of the assertion that India is cultivated by slaves. If it was, *the East India Company would not hold possession long enough to send a despatch to the Governor-General.* It is true that among the innumerable tribes and castes that compose the immense population of India, vestiges of slavery may be found. The writer of this has been eight years in India, and *once saw a girl,* who was said to have been sold by her parents in her infancy, as the means of escaping from famine. But there was *no law* that enforced any results from such a fact. To have gone before a British magistrate with any plea founded on such a claim, would have been as absurd in India, as it would six years afterwards when the same girl was in England. This is what the West-Indians trust to. It would not be much trouble to the governors of India at home, to send out five lines in a despatch, disavowing all recognition of the estate of personal slavery throughout their vast domains; and they have as manifest an interest in doing it, as in sending to inquire the price of cotton.

After these, come the counsellors, who advise the postponing the attempt to remove the West-Indian nuisance, till it

can be clearly proved that there are no nuisances elsewhere; being in point of wisdom and excellent judgment, on a par with him who should recommend the *not* killing a flea in Grosvenor-Square, till it can be ascertained that there are none in Monmouth Street. It may be quite true, that the people of England are suffering in countless ways,—that no man can look out of his window without seeing urgent calls for his interference and his charity;—*but how does this make it desirable that the West-Indians should be supported by a poll-tax?* Has anybody demonstrated what balance there is, between the community's being oppressed (for instance) by the Corn Laws, and being indulged with the privilege of supporting the West-Indian body?—how one tends to remedy the other, or why if *one* cannot be got rid of for the present, *the other* should not if it can? Men never make such arguments as this for nothing. Some portion of the plunder drains into their mouths; or they live in hope that it may drain hereafter. They are the warier confederates in the fraud; not bold enough to be put forward as the prime agents themselves, but anxious to deserve well of their community by exerting their small talents to confound the right.

The upshot and conclusion, is to call upon men of all classes, to lay aside for a moment their differences in politics and in religion, and join in removing from us and ours this foul disgrace upon a nation calling itself free. Tomorrow, tug at each others' throats, if it must be so; but today let there be a "Truce of God,"—a suspension of arms like that under which the besiegers and besieged meet, to remove the carcase that is spreading plague on both. There are certain things on which, it would appear, mankind were made to differ; but there are also certain things, on which it is sure, that they were made to agree. In such a cause, let the Church-of-England-man follow his bishops, and the sectary remember only the murder of his missionary in Demerara. Let the emancipated Catholic reflect, how closely allied have been the principles of the present question and of his own,—and well consider the sound policy there would be in driving his enemies from the position they have occupied beyond. All creatures of ill omen,—every odious and foul bird, that has threatened anybody or tormented anybody,—take roost and harbour in the question of West-Indian slavery, and sit there in readiness to pounce on the first exposed member of liberty at home. All that is good and distinguished in the country, is against them; and waits only to be joined by the *momentum* of a united community, to give the one cheer more which will be the last. Never mind a little obloquy; nobody cares for the reviling of the individuals on whom society is put-

ting force, nor of those who back them. It is part of their unhappy state and condition; you would not be an honest man, if they had nothing to say against you. Reject with utter scorn, all requests that you will abstain from letting the sufferers know what you think of their oppressors. You are not part of the plot; you are on the other side; there is no fairness in telling you, that you must hold your tongue, or else your adversaries will be "exceedingly uncomfortable." Say boldly, that you act with the express design to spread the information, that you and your countrymen are in motion on the other side of the Atlantic. All these things, in one way or another, go to your suffering comrades in Jamaica in the end; and tend to increase the pressure which will finally remove your wrong and theirs. There is not an old woman that gives sixpence to the cause of negro freedom in England, that does not make the heart of a slave-owner sink within him. If the slave-owners can be kept upon old women's sixpences, they can be pulled down by old women's sixpences. The contributions of the people are never despised, except when they are to be made an honest use of. Omit no means, however trivial, that may evince your sense of wrong, and tend to multiply it. When a comedian makes a lucky hit, his grotesque figure in cheap clay displays itself on the chimney-piece of half the working-men in England. Make a figure of a negro woman, and write under it, "We still pay a poll-tax to support the flogging of women in Jamaica." And when you can add to it the date of the removal of the evil, leave it to your posterity as a proof that their fathers though humble were not mean,—that though poor, they were much too good to be worked in their own country, for the sake of enabling the rich to work slaves in another.

(*Reprinted at the time, and largely circulated.*)

POSTSCRIPT.

From the Westminster Review for 1 *January*, 1830.

It has been objected to the comparison between the case of the Mosses and that of Esther Hibner, that "it would be quite as just and true to say, that because Lord Ferrers, and Fauntleroy, and Hunton were hanged, all the peers of Great Britain are addicted to the crime of murder, and that all the bankers and quakers are, to a man, swindlers and forgers." For this objection to have any force, Lord Ferrers should have been *not* hanged, and the peers should have given him a dinner on the expiration of his confinement; the bankers should have done the same to Fauntleroy, and the quakers to Hunton.

It has been stated that the Article is "ferocious and treason

able." The Article was written to try the question. It was written to settle the point, whether the planters are to announce their intention of transferring their allegiance, and the public in England is not to announce its good wishes for the faithful population. Those who live in glass houses, ought not to have begun throwing stones.

It has been said that the object of the Article was "to deluge the colonies with blood." Men have no right to threaten rebellion with one breath, and to demand a careful attention to their comfort with another. At the same time, it is palpable that the object was not to produce bloodshed, but to produce that acquiescence in the intimations of the British government which is the only means of finally preventing it.

It has been affirmed that to take off the duty in favour of West-Indian sugar, *would not* lower the price of sugar in England. Now it is clear that if the extra duty was taken off, the raisers of East-Indian sugar could raise and sell more than they do; and therefore, even though the price of sugar should fall only by the inconsiderable quantity necessary to give East-Indian sugar the power of entry into the market, the West-Indians must sell less. But if they are to sell less, the competition among themselves will induce those who can best afford it to lower the price. The price of West-Indian sugar therefore will meet the other half-way. This might not take place during the first year, or the second; but it is impossible for it to be finally prevented by any alterations in the price at any other place, that may be consequent on the alteration in the demand for West-Indian sugar in England.

If the people of England cannot get rid of such an abuse as being taxed to support slavery, what chance have they of getting rid of any other? And if they desire to get rid of any other, what policy so clear as beginning with the abuse whose supporters support all the rest, as knowing that whenever reform begins, their own must go the first?

Westminster Review, 1 October, 1829.

Art. XI.—*Essays on the Pursuit of Truth, on the Progress of Knowledge, and on the Fundamental Principle of all Evidence and Expectation.* By the Author of "Essays on the Formation and Publication of Opinions." London. R. Hunter. 1829. 8vo. pp. 302.

IF a man could be offered the paternity of any comparatively modern books that he chose, he would not hazard much by

deciding, that next after the "Wealth of Nations" he would request to be honoured with a relationship to the "Essays on the Formation and Publication of Opinions*." It would have been a glorious thing to have been the father of the mathematics of grown gentlemen;—to have saved nations from fraud, by inventing the science of detecting the pillage of the few upon the many, the "practical men" protesting the while against its inferences, as defaulting purse-bearers protest against arithmetic. It would have been a splendid triumph, to have set up the "lever which will move the world;" and have originated the process of discovery, which heads of Houses are called on to prohibit, lest knowledge should become insupportable, and Oxford "man have too much light." But next to this, it would have been a pleasant and an honourable memory, to have written a book so *totus teres atque rotundus*, so finished in its parts and so perfect in their union, as the "Essays on the Formation of Opinions." Like one of the great statues of antiquity, it might have been broken into fragments, and each separated limb would have pointed to the existence of some interesting whole, of which the value might be surmised from the beauty of the specimen.

Another book from the same author, must have a powerful claim to the attention of those who have been delighted with the first. It is in fact but the prolongation of the other; or relates to subjects so closely joined, that it may be a question whether the two make two existences or one. The first Essay is on the pursuit of truth, and on the *duty* of inquiry. There is a fund of novelty in that word *duty*. It is not everybody that has found it out, but still the truth is, that what men have hitherto been taught, is that it is their duty to accept of certain propositions *without* inquiry; or which comes to the same thing, that their inquiries shall be directed in such a course as shall lead to *one* result. All the instructions given from the bench to the great jury of mankind, have purported that "You shall well and truly try, and *a verdict for defendant* give;"—a man was not supposed honest, who contemplated the possibility of the decision being on the other side. Rules were laid down, concerning the frame of mind in which evidence was to be received and gone into,—and touching the cases in which it was meet or not meet that the evidence should be looked into at all, —the whole having a direct bearing on the object stated, of causing the verdict to be for said defendant and for nobody else.

In opposition to all this, stands up the counsel on the other

* London, R. Hunter, 1826. 8vo. pp. 320.

side, and pleads for the sake of the impression he may make on individual opinions, however far he may be from altering the forms of the court or the *dicta* of the judge. And first, of the *importance* of finding out what is truth, even though it should go against the loved defendant.—

'It is hoped that an honest and fearless endeavour to trace what our duty is in relation to inquiry, will not in the present day be ill received. There is a growing disposition in the world, amongst the intelligent part of it at least, to prize truth and veracity, to look with disdain on all artifice, disingenuity, and disguise, to regard the business of life no longer as an affair which demands unremitted intrigue and perpetual deceit, to consider the great interests of humanity as not requiring to be supported by ignorance and superstition, to believe that suppression and concealment can be of no service, except to the few at the expense of the many, and that every important question should be freely and boldly examined.'—p. 6.

'That it intimately concerns mankind, that not only the properties of external nature, but the consequences of human actions, the effects of different agencies on our sensibility, the results of the various combinations of society on individual happiness, the relations of man to other beings, should be precisely ascertained and accurately understood, is a proposition so undeniable, when clearly expressed, as barely to escape the character of a truism. The overwhelming importance of this knowledge, is attested by the sad tale of error and suffering, which every page of history presents to our observation. What possible problem can mankind have to solve but one, how to make themselves conjointly as happy, and for that purpose as noble-minded and virtuous as they can during the short term of their mortal existence? And how have they hitherto solved this problem? In what numerous ways have they proved themselves totally blind to their real interests, perverted their resources, exasperated the unavoidable evils of their condition, and inflicted gratuitous and unprofitable misery on each other and on themselves? It is clear that men can have no interest in suffering, no preference for unhappiness in itself, and wherever they are found in headlong career after it, it must be under an impression that they are in pursuit of a different object. It is error therefore, it is illusion, it is an incapacity on their part to see the real consequences of actions, the real issues of events, that gives rise to all those evils which desolate the world, except such as can be traced to the physical circumstances of man's nature and condition*.'

'The prevalence of misery, as the consequence of ignorance, shows at once the paramount importance of the pursuit of accurate knowledge. To discover truth, is in fact to do good on a grand scale. The detection of an error, the establishment of a fact, the determination of a doubtful principle, may spread its benefits over large portions of the human race, and be the means of lessening the misery or increasing

* "Error is the universal cause of the misery of mankind," are the first words of Malebranche in his Treatise on the 'Search after Truth.'

the happiness of myriads of unborn generations. The great interests of mankind then demand, that the way of discovery should be open, that there should be no obstructions to inquiry, that every facility and encouragement should be given to efforts which are directed to the detection of their errors; and yet one of the greatest discouragements which at present exists, is the state of their own moral sentiments. Although he who has achieved the discovery of truth in a matter of importance, has the satisfaction of reflecting that he has conferred a benefit on his fellow-men to which time itself can prescribe no limits, the probability is, that instead of attracting sympathy and gratitude, he will meet with a considerable share of odium and persecution as the consequence of his perspicacity.'—p. 8.

How different is this exordium from the language of the paid philosophers, who see no chance of propping what they call the right, but by the mixture of portions of acknowledged error;—who wail over the loss of the people's "instinctive belief" in that which is not, and think nothing harmless which does not include a modicum of falsehood. If a man cannot be made to believe in the divine right of kings, it is better than nothing, to make him believe in a ghost. There is great sympathy among hobgoblins. The days of fairy Puck, were the days of friar Tuck; and it was incomparably easier to preserve a mental domination over men who feared the cloven foot at every corner of the parish, than over the present generation who defy the devil and all his works, and go doggedly to vote for the man they think will pull down the select vestry. The lovers of fiction do not serve their god for naught. Like the worshippers of Bel, their tracks all point to substantial feeding in the end. Their politics universally smell of their butt of sack; and their best piety has a certain odour of pudding. Whether they speak in their proper persons, or bring a spirit from the deep to be their spokesman, it is always too plain that they are preaching for the pot. All their reasonings are directed to a certain end; and that end is one closely connected with the power, or the interest, or the prejudices of the reasoners.

For example, when were they known to describe the state of mind desirable in the pursuit of truth, as follows?

'Every one must at once see, that a simple and sincere desire to arrive at the truth, without any predilection in favour of any opinion whatever, and without any other disturbing feeling of affection or dislike, or hope or fear, is the moral state of mind most favourable to the success of inquiry. If a man is possessed with a desire to find a given opinion true, or to confirm himself in a doctrine which he already entertains, he will in all probability pay a partial attention to the arguments and evidence in its favour, to the neglect of opposite considerations; but if he is free from all wishes of this kind, if he has no predilection to gratify, if his desires are directed solely to the attainment

of correct views, he will naturally search for information wherever it is likely to present itself; he will be without motive for partiality, and susceptible of the full force of evidence.'

'However unaccountable it may at first sight appear, it is a fact, that few human beings, in their moral, religious, and political inquiries, are possessed with this simple wish of attaining truth: their strongest wishes are directed to the discovery of new grounds for adhering to opinions already formed; and they are as deaf to arguments on the opposite side as they are alive to evidence in favour of their own views. The pure wish to arrive at truth is indeed as rare as the integrity which strictly observes the golden rule to act towards others as we would wish others to act towards us. For this several reasons may be assigned. A principal one is, that men's interests are often indissolubly connected with the prevalence of certain opinions; they are therefore naturally anxious to find out every possible ground why these opinions should be held: their personal consequence too is often implicated in their support; they are pledged by their rank or office, or previous declarations, to the maintenance of a determinate line of argument, and they feel that it would be a disparagement to their intellectual powers and to their reputation, were it proved to be unsound.'—p. 14.

'These, and other similar circumstances, create in the mind a desire to find some given opinion true; and of course, as far as their influence extends, extinguish the desire to find the truth.'—p. 17.

There can be no doubt that these are the reasons, why the orthodox are every-where the orthodox. It matters not whether it be at Constantinople or at Notre Dame; there is always a way that all right-thinking people fall into.

The next object of the author is to ascertain in what circumstances inquiry is a duty. And he concludes that, without pretending to a complete enumeration, this duty is incumbent on all who can be brought under the following classes;—

'1. Those whose professed office it is to teach others.

2. Those who voluntarily undertake to instruct others.

3. All those who have the means and opportunity of inquiry on subjects which have an important bearing on their moral actions or conduct in society.'—p. 25.

'On all persons, who come under these three classes, it may be stated to be incumbent to pursue their inquiries till they can clearly trace satisfactory conclusions from undeniable premises. No one ought to be satisfied with his opinions on any subject of importance, much less ought he to inculcate them on others, unless he can trace their connexion with self-evident principles.'

'It is not easy to imagine how this plain statement can be controverted or denied; yet there are frequent cases in actual life, where the duty of inquiry, if not positively rejected, is really evaded. There are several pretexts employed on these occasions: inquiry might lead to doubt or perplexity; to become acquainted with opposite arguments

might shake the settled convictions of the understanding; to read the writings of adversaries might contaminate the mind with false views.'—p. 27.

'There is no foreseeing how far the subtlety of interest and indolence may go, and it may be possibly assigned as a further reason for his declining inquiry, that he may come to some fallacy which he cannot surmount, although convinced of its character. If he is convinced of its character, he must either have grounds for that conviction or not. If he has grounds, let him examine them, draw them out, try if they are valid, and then the fallacy will stand exposed. If he has no grounds for suspecting a fallacy, what an irrational conclusion he confesses himself to have arrived at! But he may reply—he may be unable to solve the difficulty, he may be perplexed, and the issue may be, that it would have been much better had he remained in his former strong though unenlightened conviction. Why better? If he is in perplexity, let him read, think, consult the learned and the wise, and the result will probably be, a definite opinion on one side or the other. But if he still remain in doubt, where is the harm, or rather why is it not to be considered a good? The subject is evidently one which admits strong probabilities on opposite sides. Doubt, therefore, is the proper sentiment with which to regard it: it is the result of the best exercise of the faculties; and either positively to believe, or positively to disbelieve, would imply an erroneous appreciation of evidence.'

'In the minds of some people, a strong prejudice appears to exist against that state of the understanding which is termed doubt. A little reflection, however, will convince any one, that on certain subjects doubt is as appropriate a state of mind as belief or disbelief on others. There are doctrines, propositions, facts, supported and opposed by every degree of evidence, and many amongst them by that degree of evidence of which the proper effect is to leave the mind in an equipoise between two conclusions. In these cases, either to believe or disbelieve would imply that the understanding was improperly affected. Doubt is the appropriate result, which there can be no reason to shrink from or lament.'

'But it is further urged, that inquiry might contaminate the mind with false views; and therefore it is wise and laudable to abstain from it.'

'We can understand what is meant by contaminating a man's habits, or disposition, or even imagination. If a man read impure books, or works of extravagant fiction and false taste, his imagination will inevitably be coloured by the ideas presented, and the conceptions which subsequently rise up in his mind will partake of the impurity and extravagance with which he has been conversant. But there is no analogy on this point between the understanding and the imagination. There is contamination in preposterous and obscene images crowding before the intellectual vision, notwithstanding a full and distinct perception of their character; but there is no contamination no evil in a thousand false arguments coming before the mind, if their quality is clearly discerned. The only possible evil in this case is mistaking false for true; but the man who shrinks from investigation

lest he should mistake false for true, can have no reason for supposing himself free from that delusion in his actual opinions. That he should be more likely to escape from error without than with investigation, is a species of absurdity which requires no exposure.'

'On no plea, therefore, can investigation be declined. That it should unsettle a man's established convictions, or that it should lead to ultimate doubt, may be a good: the one is the necessary preliminary to passing from error to truth; the other, if ultimately produced, is most likely to be the proper state of mind in relation to the particular subject examined. That inquiry should contaminate his mind is also a vain allegation. The only meaning which can be attached to the phrase, implies a misconception of falsehood for truth, a delusion, which inquiry is not only the direct means of preventing, but of dissipating if he is already involved in it.'

'Whoever fears to examine the foundation of his opinions, and enter on the consideration of any train of counter-argument, *may rest assured, that he has some latent apprehension of their unsoundness and incapacity of standing investigation.* And as a fear of this sort is totally at variance with that spirit of candour and fairness which we have already seen to be the proper disposition for the attainment of truth, no man should suffer it to prevent him from boldly engaging in the requisite examination. A great deal of invective has been levelled at free-thinking. The only distinction worth attending to on this point is that between accurate and inaccurate, true and false. Thinking can never be too free, provided it is just.'—p. 29.

The most remarkable phenomenon attendant on the objections to inquiry, is that the objections which are good at Notre Dame, are equally good at Constantinople, and yet the things defended are not the same. Since, therefore, it is not a common truth, it must be a common interest. There are certain comfortable possessions and holdings at both places, dependent on the supporting a particular state of belief; and though the beliefs are not the same, the orthodoxy is.

Some of the most powerful impediments to inquiry are next stated.—

'One of these is a fear that we may search too far, and be guilty of presumption in prying into things we ought not to know: another prejudice is, that we may contract guilt should we arrive at erroneous conclusions, or conclusions at variance with such as are established; and another, that it is a sort of praiseworthy humility to acquiesce in received opinions, on the authority of others, and refrain from thinking for ourselves.'

'A brief space will not be ill bestowed in setting these prejudices in their true light.'

'As to the first, a few words will suffice to prove that nothing can be more irrational and unfounded. We have shown in another place*

* 'Essay on the Publication of Opinions.'

that truth is conducive to human happiness; the attainment of it, one of the highest objects of human enterprise; and the free exercise of our faculties on all subjects, the means of securing this invaluable blessing. If this is a correct representation, investigation is a pursuit in which there is every thing to hope and nothing to fear, and to which there are no limits but such as the nature of our own faculties prescribes.'

'It is not easy to conceive with exactness what can possibly be apprehended from inquiry; what is the precise danger or difficulty it is expected to involve us in; what is implied in the fear that we may search too far.'

'Some indeed appear to have imagined that inquiry might conduct us to forbidden truths. As there are secret transactions amongst our superiors in society, or even our associates, which we should be culpable in prying into; sealed documents circulating in the world, sacred to those whose names they bear, and not to be scrutinized with honour by any of the intermediate agents through whose hands they pass; records of private affairs, kept solely for the use of the individuals concerned in them, and which we are not to come upon by stealth, and rifle of their information: and as to infringe the privacy of these matters would be stigmatized as indelicate, meddling, presumptuous; so it seems to be supposed that there are closed documents in nature into which we are forbidden to look, private processes going on into which we have no right to intrude, truths existing which are not to be profaned by our scrutiny, and to attempt to make ourselves acquainted with these is unjustifiable audacity and presumption. If this prejudice does not often assume the definite form here ascribed to it, it may frequently be found exerting an influence without a distinct consciousness in the mind over which it prevails.'

'A more striking instance of a completely false analogy could not be adduced. There is not a single point of resemblance throughout the whole field of knowledge to these little secrets, the offspring of human weakness, or the indispensable resources of human imperfection. There is no secret in the natural or the moral world, sacred from the investigation of man. Here there can be no presumption, no undue boldness, no counterpart at all to the audaciousness of one man intruding upon the privacy of another. All that man has to guard against, and that simply for his own sake, is error; his vigilance is required only to ensure that his facts are properly ascertained, and his inferences correctly deduced. The presumption he has to repress, is not any presumption in relation to other beings in possession of secrets, which he is trying clandestinely to wrest from them, but merely the presumption of drawing positive and ample conclusions from doubtful and slender premises, of supposing that he has discovered what he has not, that he has succeeded where he has only failed, that he has done what still remains to be accomplished; in a word, the presumption of over-rating his own achievements. Here indeed a man may err in self-confidence, but an evil cannot obviously arise from searching too far, which is best remedied by searching farther, by closer reasoning and more rigorous investigation.'

'The strangest absurdities indeed would be involved in the supposition that we could possibly reach to knowledge, which we ought not to attain. We are placed in this world by the Creator of the universe, surrounded with certain objects and endowed with certain faculties. From these objects, with these faculties, it is implied by the hypothesis under consideration, we may extort secrets which he never designed to be known, extract information which Omnipotence wished to withhold!'—p. 35.

In the midst of the objections thrown in the way of inquiry, sufficient weight has scarcely ever been given to the contingency on the opposite side, that the Creator of the universe should at some time demand of his creatures, *how and why*, with such faculties and opportunities as had been bestowed on them, their progress had been so small in the knowledge of what he had placed within their reach;—why, for example, their opinion of his own nature was in many instances so crude, so gross, and so much at variance with what would constitute a pure and faultless human being. Why should not this be viewed as an extensive danger, as well as the other? And why should not men make provision for answering this question at their final audit, as well as for establishing their acquiescence in some human Creed, and their perfect acquaintance with any given number of Articles?

'The second prejudice above enumerated, that we may contract guilt if in the course of inquiry we miss the right conclusion, is still more prevalent and influential. On a former occasion* we have shown, that nothing can be more at variance with reason, than an apprehension of this nature. As our opinions on any subject are not voluntary acts but involuntary effects, in whatever conclusions our researches terminate, they can involve us in no culpability. All that we have to take care of, as we shall more largely show hereafter, is to bestow on every subject an adequate and impartial attention. Having done this, we have discharged our duty, and it would be irrational and unmanly to entertain any apprehension for the result.'

'In fact, there is the grossest inconsistency in the prejudice now under consideration. If we may contract guilt by inquiry, we may contract guilt by remaining in our present state. The only valid reason which can be assigned, why we may commit an offence by embarking in any inquiry is, that we may miss the right conclusion; but it is obvious that we may equally miss it by remaining in our actual opinions. It is then incumbent on us to know, whether we are committing an offence by remaining in our present opinions; in other words, it is necessary to inquire whether these opinions are true; thus the reason assigned for not inquiring, leads itself to the conclusion that it is necessary to inquire.'—p. 40.

'A man, indeed, after the best and most dispassionate investiga-

* 'Essay on the Formation of Opinions.'

tion of an important subject, may naturally feel a degree of anxiety lest he should after all have missed the truth; but in this anxiety there is not, or ought not to be, the slightest admixture of moral uneasiness. It is an anxiety, lest his conclusions, when they come to form the ground of his actions or of his instructions to others, should lead to consequences which he did not anticipate. His conclusions may be wrong, and the consequences disastrous; but if he has a proper view of the matter, there will be none of the stings of remorse, not the faintest accusation of conscience. Having inquired to the best of his power, he has done all that depended on himself, and would exhibit little wisdom were he to torment himself with reproaches for an unfortunate issue.'—p. 41.

'The third prejudice we have to consider is, that acquiescence in received opinions, or forbearing according to the common phrase to think for ourselves, evinces a degree of humility highly proper and commendable.'

'If we examine the matter closely, nevertheless, we shall find that it usually evinces nothing but a great degree of indolent presumption or intellectual cowardice. There is often, in truth, as great a measure of presumption in this species of acquiescence as in the boldest hypothesis which the human invention can start. That received or established opinions are true, is one of those sweeping conclusions, which would require very strong reasons and often elaborate research to justify it. On what grounds are they considered to be true by one who declines investigation? Because (on the most favourable supposition) they have been handed down to us by our predecessors, and have been regarded with conviction by a multitude of illustrious men. But what comprehensive reasons are these! What investigation would it require to show they were valid! As the whole history of mankind teems with instances of the transmission of the grossest errors from one generation to another, and of their having been countenanced by the concurrence of the most eminent of the race; what a large acquaintance with the peculiarities of the generations preceding us, and the circumstances of the great men to whom we appeal, it would require to show that this particular instance was an exemption from the general lot!'

'It is then no humility to refrain from inquiry; on the contrary, it is the proper kind of humility; or if it is not humility, it is the proper feeling for the occasion, to be determined to do all in our power to make ourselves acquainted with every subject on which it is necessary for us to pronounce or profess an opinion.'—p. 42.

'Let the inquirer then enter on his task with full confidence that he is embarking in no criminal, or forbidden, or presumptuous undertaking. Let him be as circumspect as he pleases in collecting his facts and deducing his conclusions, cautious in the process, but fearless in the result. Let him be fully aware of his liability to error, of the thousand sources of illusion, of the limited powers of the individual, of the paramount importance of truth; but let him dismiss all conscientious apprehensions of the issue of an investigation, conducted with due application of mind and rectitude of purpose.'—p. 46.

The next chapter is on the duties incumbent on mankind in the process of inquiry. These are reduced to two; examination, in the first place, of the state of our own minds in reference to the subject of inquiry; and secondly, examination of the subject itself, and of the evidence appertaining to it. The notion that it is a man's duty to believe certain prescribed doctrines, is combated in a manner that might entitle the author to the epithet of *malleus anti-hereticorum.* There is no man who has ever been offended by the virulence of orthodoxy, or tempted to needless disbelief by the puerility of its general style of argument, who will not exult in the clear and complete statement here presented, of what has with more or less distinctness passed through his own mind upon the subject, though he lacked the power to form it into a connected whole.

The chapter on the influence of the institutions and practices of society on the pursuit of truth, classes among the most prominent of the retarding causes, the institutions which bestow emolument on individuals with the stipulation that they teach certain doctrines definitively prescribed, and in fact the annexation of any advantage whatever, whether by positive institution or by the habits of the community, to any particular opinions. To these may be added the converse of the same form of injustice; which is the annexation of suffering or loss, as the consequence of deciding in a certain way,—or persecution. Both are equally opposed to the attainment of the truth; though in different manners. Bribery attracts men's decision from the right; persecution rivets it upon the wrong.

The concluding chapter is on the spirit in which the results of inquiry ought to be communicated and received. It may be considered as a kind of Review of Reviews, and it is difficult to imagine that the author had not in sight some case in which he has individually suffered from the petulance of criticism.

The second essay is a dialogue between *A* and *N* on the Progress of Knowledge. *N* is a dissatisfied, complaining kind of consonant, who takes something very much like a Tory view of the advances and prospects of the human race. *A* is a more cheerful and open-hearted vocable, and stands up stoutly for the opinion that "intellect" has "marched," is marching, and will continue to march rapidly in spite of all that can be done to hinder it. *N*, however, cannot help kindling, on coming to the invention of printing; though he still indulges himself in a belief, that the progress must on the whole be slow. *A* opposes him, and *N* again relaxes into a ghastly smile on the mention of political economy. "Twenty or thirty years ago the doctrines of Adam Smith were apparently a dead letter; his book was considered by that sapient race, the practical men, as full of

Utopian dreams. Pitt did not fully comprehend it, and Fox declared it past understanding. A first-rate statesman in the present day would be scouted for equal ignorance. The prevalence of this science will do good. It is a lever which will move the world." The consonant is clearly no Tory; he speaks moreover but lightly of the "collective wisdom," and his speech was indited before the fatal minority on the Catholic question. In a subsequent conversation he turns out little better than a Radical;—believes that a progress in literature and science must be accompanied by progressive changes in our social and political institutions;—thinks—the traitor—that a glance at the misery around us is sufficient to show they have not arrived at perfection;—opines that the tendency of political change is now evidently to republicanism, and it is not unlikely that the existing governments of Europe will gradually approximate to the form adopted in the United States of America. He admits that form to be at present unsuitable to the feelings and habits of Europeans, which still retain a strong tinge of the spirit of the middle ages. But there are certain principles, he maintains, which are making daily advances, and which in proportion as they subvert the ancient spirit of hereditary attachment, will render it unnecessary and substitute a better in its place. Such, he says, are the principles, that government is for the benefit of the whole community;—that to ensure the attainment of this end, the will of the majority ought to prevail;—that to secure the benefits of government, the people must strictly conform to the regulations which they themselves have imposed; and the corollaries flowing from these propositions. From these opinions *A* dissents; with a view, no doubt, to prevent a prosecution from the Constitutional Association. And his opponent, having done all the mischief he can, is not anxious at present to discuss the merits of any forms of government; all he means to contend for is, that whichever is really the best must in the natural course of improvement establish its claims to preference. It is difficult to deny that there is something astute in the deportment of this last-mentioned disputant. Nevertheless the dialogue is one of the most valuable that has been carried on among the letters of the alphabet, since the remote period of the grand confederation against Apple-pie.

The third and last essay is on the Principle of Evidence and Expectation. This principle is stated to be, the assumption or belief of the "uniformity of causation;" or in other words, the persuasion that the causes which have produced certain effects in time past, will produce effects of the same kind hereafter. A chapter is devoted to the demonstration, that the uniformity of

causation cannot be established by experience or testimony. It appears certain that it cannot be fully and completely established, even with relation to past events; and for the simple reason, that we have not experience or testimony on the subject of all that is past. The true result, therefore, seems to be, that our confidence in the uniformity of causation is only dependent upon the high degree of improbability of its being interrupted at the present moment, or within any narrow period. No man can positively say, that the earth will not be destroyed by a comet next Christmas. But the fact that the earth, to our certain knowledge, has existed some thousand years without being destroyed by a comet, makes it at all events great odds, that if it is destroyed it will not be next Christmas. Whether it will be destroyed in six thousand or in sixty thousand years more, are chances for the valuation of which the data are manifestly imperfect. We know enough of the planetary system to know of an apparent possibility, that in strict conformity to the known laws of nature, and without any breach of the connection between causes and effects which has existed during the few thousand years of our acquaintance with the earth, a comet should at some time run foul of our planet, as two vessels run foul of each other at sea. Such an event would not be an interruption of the uniformity of causation, but a new developement of its tendencies. But since there is experimental proof that the danger is not of frequent recurrence, the chances are very great that the vessel will last our time. In the same way if any other event should take place exceedingly different from anything that has been witnessed in the world before, the just inference would be, that there had existed sources of causation which had been concealed from us. It is impossible to be certain that we have exhausted all the phenomena of causation; there may be causes whose tendency it is to operate in a cycle of a million of centuries, and to which the world's experience bears only the same proportion as half an hour to a year. At the same time the world's experience goes to demonstrate, that the height of human folly is to believe anything that is not proved, or anything merely because it is not proved that it will not be. We must go by the experience of our half hour, though it is but half an hour; and when it pleases heaven to give us more, we will go by that.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 October, 1829.

ART. XIII*.—1. *Le Fils de l'Homme, ou Souvenirs de Vienne; par Méry et Barthélemy.*—Paris. Chez tous les marchands de nouveautés. 1829. 8vo. pp. 55.

2. *De la Charte selon l'Aristocratie.*—Paris. Constitutionnel du 4 septembre 1829.

OF all expectations the most unreasonable, is that a nation will give up its independence, to please its enemies. What *is* its independence, and who *are* its enemies,—are questions on which there is often an extensive difference of opinion between the nation most immediately concerned and foreigners. The safest way, therefore, for a foreigner to judge, is to suppose himself in the place of the other party, and surmise as nearly as he can what would be his own sensations if the circumstances were his own. This may not be the way to keep up the spirit of national intoxication which governors are apt to call patriotism, and which enables them to play off the people of one country against those of another for purposes of their own. But it is an exceedingly good way of enabling a sane man to exercise a wholesome judgment on what is likely to be the future conduct of other men, and saving him the trouble of miscalculations thereupon.

If the last William had been driven from the throne of England, by the arms of Louis the XIV, acting successfully upon the principle that what ought to be the government of England is a secret known to Frenchmen; and if it had happened, as it did not, that William had left a son behind him, who had been received and acknowledged as the heir to the English (while it *was* the English) throne;—under all these circumstances it would be perfectly undeniable, that there would have been a great numerical mass of Englishmen who would have cast a longing look upon the period of their country's independence, and on the claimant who was so closely connected with its memory. It might have been a very low and degraded species of Englishman that would have done this. All men of right feeling might have been perfectly convinced, that duty and glory were on the side of submission to the French dicta-

* This article, as its date imports, was published nearly a year before the "Three Days" of Paris and the Belgian revolution; under the title of *Change of Ministry in France.* The British objects detailed in it, have been since secured by the establishment of Belgium as an independent power.

In a conversation the writer had with Carrel in St. Pelagie in November 1834, with the object of urging a union among the Liberals of different countries and the sacrifice of national animosities, that eminent individual asked him "whether he meant to say there ever was anybody in England liberal enough to wish France to recover Belgium." There is something like an answer here.—*Added in* 1839.

tion. But still there would have been a numerical mass,—base and degenerate perhaps, but still English,—who would have looked forward to all and every way of replacing their country in the rank of independent powers, and with whom all minor advantages in the mode of doing, would have been swallowed up in the object of ridding Great Britain of the foreign appointee. It is quite clear that there would have been great bodies of Englishmen, who would have lived only for this object,—who would have carried it hidden in their hearts, through any period of time that necessity might have imposed on them, —and have handed it over to their successors at their death, as the first and last legacy their fathers had to leave. And nothing could have been more absurd than for any Frenchman,—however loyal and decorous the contrary profession might have been held in his own country,—seriously to expect anything else, but that this spirit, sooner or later, would break out into successful action, and England be England again, in spite of the efforts of foreigners abroad, and traitors at home.

It would be utter folly for an Englishman, at the present moment, to buy into the stocks, without taking into his account the certainty that the self-same principle must operate in France. The question may not have a very close connexion with his immediate proceedings, but it may possibly have *some*,—it is quite of magnitude enough to be thought of; and, so far, it is a substantial contingency which he has a right to meditate and to revolve.

One overt instance of the stirring of this principle, is presented by the history of the book entitled "*Le Fils de l'Homme.*" There are not many Englishmen whom it is necessary to inform, that the late Emperor of France is in that country called "The Man;" a term awfully significant of the feelings with which he is recollected. An individual whom thirty millions call "The Man," must have been regarded with a strange intensity of love on the part of some, and fear of others. That a million and a half of soldiers were required to move him from the throne to which he had been raised, is the best known measure of the side and the extent to which the balance preponderated. This "Man" had a son; and the son still lives, though in a strange state of mental bondage and constraint. Two young Frenchmen, joint makers of poetry by profession, undertook a kind of Blondel-like journey to his prison-house, with the professed object of presenting him with a poem of their composition on his father's expedition to Egypt. As might be expected, they were stopped at the gate. They obtained, however, a view of the prisoner, and determined that he looked most suspiciously pale; a circumstance which is necessary for the understanding

of a portion of the sequel. On their return to France they indited another poem, which is not without curiosity as a specimen of the way in which national sentiments break out under the compression of foreign force. Their principal weapon, as might be surmised, is the employment of dubious allusions to the existing state of things,

adorne in modi
Novi, che sono accuse, e paion lodi.

In the end, however, they speak more plainly*; as an extract from near the conclusion of the work will show.

† Car, si la politique, en changemens féconde,
Une dernière fois bouleversant le monde,
Sous des prétextes vains divisait sans retour
L'irascible amitié de l'une et l'autre Cour;
Si, le fer à la main, vingt nations entières,
Paraissant tout-à-coup, autour de nos frontières,
Réveillaient le tocsin des suprêmes dangers;
Surtout si, dans les rangs des soldats étrangers,
L'homme au pâle visage, effrayant météore,
Venait en agitant un lambeau tricolore;
Si sa voix résonnait à l'autre bord du Rhin—
Comme dans Josaphat la trompette d'airain,
La trompette puissante aux siècles annoncée
Suscitera les morts dans leur couche glacée;
Qui sait si cette voix, fertile en mille échos,

* The authors of the *Fils de l'Homme* were acquitted by the tribunal before which they were first cited. An appeal, however, was lodged by the Avocat du Roi to the Cour Royale, which decided that there was ground for accusation; and on the 29th of July, M. Barthélemy, as the principal author, along with the printer and the two publishers of the poem, was again brought before the tribunal of Correctional Police (sixth chamber) on the double charge, 1st, of attacks against the royal dignity and the rights to the throne which the king derives from his birth; 2nd, of provocations, not followed with effect, to the overthrow of the legitimate monarchy. After a trial of some hours, in which M. Barthélemy defended himself in a poem of considerable length, recited from memory, he was found guilty, and sentenced to a fine of a thousand francs and three months imprisonment; the printer to a fine of twenty-five francs, and the two publishers were acquitted.—*Foreign Quarterly Review.* No. VIII.

(*Translation by a friend.*)

† For, if of politics the changeful whirl
Once more the world should from its balance hurl,
And turn the hollow friendships of the state
Into the lasting jealousy of hate;
If once again, with unsheath'd swords, advance
Twice ten proud nations to the lines of France,
And mighty dangers sound the tocsin loud,—
O then, if midst the warrior strangers' crowd
The pale-faced man, the meteor of affright—
Shake the tri-colour'd tatters in our sight;—
If from beyond the boundary Rhine he speak—
As in Jehoshaphat the trump shall break
The icy silence of the slumbering dead,

D'un peuple de soldats n'éveillerait les os ?
Si d'un père exilé renouvelant l'histoire,
Domptant des ennemis complices de sa gloire,
L'usurpateur nouveau, de bras en bras porté,
N'entrerait pas en Roi dans la grande cité ?
Tels, au bruyans accords des cris et des fanfares,
Les princes chevelus, dans les Gaules barbares,
Paraissaient au milieu des Francs et des Germains,
Montés sur des pavois soutenus par leurs mains.

This only proves that *one* of the elements at present at work in France is an attachment to the memory of Napoleon in the person of his son. There is no doubt that the success of this, as indeed of almost any of the elements of change, would produce the same kind of effects on France, and by reverberation, on England, that were produced by the removal of the Stuarts. It would be an undoing of the works of the English Tories, which could not fail to be highly acceptable to all that really love the principles of the Revolution of 1688. But there are evidently other schemes on foot for the accomplishment of the same end; and a principal difficulty in the accomplishment of any, will probably proceed from the differences of opinion as to the mode. A strong party in France is understood to wish for a still more accurate transcript of our "Glorious Revolution;" and it is impossible that a very great number of individuals should not lean towards the republican institutions in which the gone-by greatness of their country took its rise, and which were the fountain of the energies which carried the machine through its subsequent forms of power. History has shown that the effect of Revolutions in the manner of 1688, is only temporary, and that from the moment the friends of arbitrary power cease from resistance to the new government, they apply themselves to the more dangerous operation of making the government their own. It is true that a hundred years is a period of some importance in the history of the human race; but still, nobody gives as much for a lease for a hundred years, as for the chance of property in perpetuity. On the question of young Napoleon, there is no denying, that he would be much more in his place in Poland. The situation of the friends of liberty in France is

---

And wake the last archangel's note of dread;—
Who knows—if with its thousand echoes loud,
The soldier-people would not burst their shroud,
And the old memory of the past renew
All that an exiled father's fame could do?
The new usurper, borne from arm to arm,
Might the Great City as her king alarm.
So, midst the shouts and music of the throng,
The long-hair'd Gallic princes moved along,
Borne by united Frank and German hands,
High on their shields above the joyous bands.

a perplexing one; and it is very little their well-wishers in other countries can do, but pray that they may be directed. One thing, however, seems clear,—that there is no hurry. The tide is running stronger hourly, in favour of liberty all over the world. Every delay adds to the chances of success; and insulated as the friends of freedom in different countries are, there is no principle of policy that could be so usefully impressed on all, as that it is wisdom to hold back, to the utmost of their individual power, in all the cases that fall within their immediate influence. The *débacle* will come some time without asking; but in the mean while, every man on the continent who can swallow a grief or suppress a recollection, will do a service to the general cause.

The first effort of the French people, in the event of any attempt to make themselves independent of foreign dictation, would necessarily be to recover the Belgian departments. The principle on which these departments were taken from them by the Holy Alliance, was the principle upon which it might be found convenient to take possession of every man's back door, —the power, to wit, of entry and robbing in the house. It was the same principle on which the king of England anciently delighted to hold Calais; or, as the Secretary to the Admiralty expresses it with *naïveté* in his stories for English children, "because, as Calais was so near England, he could collect all his troops and armies in that town, ready to march out into France whenever he should please to attack the French." Those who love the Holy Alliance, of course love its having possession of the back door; and those who hate it, do the contrary. The world is divided into two parts upon this subject; and there is no use in exasperating their differences, by pretending to be angry with anybody for thinking in his own way. The occupation of Belgium is the key to the system of the Holy Alliance, in the same manner as if the Holy Alliance of William's days had occupied Devonshire and Cornwall, with a view to landing troops there the moment the English should think of governing themselves. The Rhine is a territorial boundary and defence, not quite so powerful as the sea, but still powerful. In short it is the lock to the back door; and the object of the foreigner is to get rid of the obstacle. If the French could recover Belgium,—in other words, if they could shut up their back door,—the probability is, that there would be an end of the Holy Alliance influence all over the world. Spain, Portugal, and Italy, would obtain constitutional freedom; and in the end probably, the robber powers all over the world would be obliged to disembogue. The robber powers are, therefore, grievously

interested in preventing it; and for the same reason it would seem to follow, all honest people are bound to wish it well.

An English journal lately stated some objection to exist, on the ground of the immorality there would be in taking Belgium from—*the King of Holland.* The scruples of the journalist might possibly be quieted by the suggestion, that Belgium belongs *to the Belgians;* and that these are the people to be consulted, touching the nice point of consent or non-consent to the arrangement. But with respect to the Belgians, the most obvious fact is, that they are cut off from the trade of thirty millions of persons, and allowed to trade with six millions instead; which leaves little doubt which way the inclinations of the real owners of Belgium would tend.

As it is plain that France will, at some time or other, be strong enough to attempt to shut up her back door, it is greatly for the interest of the English people that they should begin betimes to consider the light in which they would view such an operation. The English of 1830 will be a very different people from the English of 1815; and all human sagacity would be at fault, if there was not a wide difference in their reasonings and conclusions.

And first, is it for the advantage of Englishmen in general, to keep up and maintain the influence of the combination of barbarous and despotic powers known briefly by the name of the Holy Alliance, upon France? Or is it for their advantage that it should as speedily as possible be thrown off? The question has had broad light thrown on it since 1815. The iniquities of Naples, of Spain, and of Portugal, have taught both the English who love freedom, and the large and influential portion of the English nation who are the foremost champions of slavery every-where, the real and veritable nature of that combination to oppress. Fifteen years' experience has made it evident, that the object and effect of that league is to crush all attempts at the amelioration of the European governments, by introducing every-where a foreign force alien to the immediate causes of complaint; in the same manner that a regiment which mutinies about the weight of a knapsack, is crushed by bringing in a division of cavalry, who have nothing to do with knapsacks at all. The barbarous powers form the key-stone to the whole. "*The North*" as it has been called, presses on France, and maintains the Bourbons on a throne; the Bourbons send an army to support Ferdinand; Ferdinand supports Miguel; and the friends of misgovernment in England point in turn to the state of the Continent, as demonstrating the impossibility there would be in popular resistance at

home. Such is the round of Holy Alliance politics in various countries; and the question seems to resolve itself into determining whether that part of the circuit which affects Englishmen, is what they desire to take positive measures to cherish and support.

Next, negatively,—Whenever the resistance on the part of France to the principles of the Holy Alliance shall take place, are the English people prepared to encounter the loss and suffering, which must necessarily be the consequence of opposing themselves to the movement, and which may possibly take place to a degree to which no absolute limits can be assigned? Are they prepared to undergo another twenty-five years war, for the sake of supporting absolute power against their own interests, and to please the Tories? And if they are prepared to try, *can* they carry on a twenty-five years war? Is it not plain in every street, and demonstrated in every workshop and parish-office, that the Tories have ruined the country once already;—that they have left it a warning and a monument, to all nations who may hereafter be disposed to trust the richer classes with irresponsible power in the expectation that they will use it wisely and well? And having ruined it once, by what art or alchymy are they to ruin it twice over? They have fired their shot and the country's, to establish a Stuart abroad; and there is no rule of the nursery more true, than that it is impossible for anybody to eat his cake and have it. They have spent by anticipation the possible wealth of possible Englishmen, for the sake of making, to the best of their abilities, a counter revolution of 1688; and have driven themselves into a corner, between the impossibility of adding to the debt, and the impossibility of getting rid of it except by an operation that would induce an equal mass of loss and suffering somewhere else. When Lord Folkstone in 1823 asked the question, to which the author of the Political Register says no one had the manhood to say a word in reply,—"Whether, if the country could not be defended without a reduction of the interest of the debt, the interest must not be reduced?"—the wonder is that no man was found to answer, that if the question was "whether all the little dogs' tails must be cut off or the country remain undefended," there could be no doubt that the little dogs' tails must give way;—but still the great question for sensible men would be, whether there was any real connexion between cutting off little dogs' tails and the country's defence, and whether the country would be at all better able to defend itself after this rueful amputation than before. The misery of the funding system is, that its effects can never be got rid of, and that to pretend to get rid of them by refusing to pay the inter-

est, must do an injury in one direction exactly equal to the apparent good in another. Suppose, for example, that London was attacked, and it was proposed to raise funds for defence by taking all the property of the inhabitants of one particular quarter of the city. Whether this might be an ease to the three quarters that escape, is not the question;—the question is, whether London is one whit stronger by having thus destroyed the property of a particular quarter, than she would have been if the amount had been levied on all alike;—whether, if she cannot afford the money in ordinary ways, she can afford it in this;—whether the destroying this particular quarter is really an invention by which nothing is destroyed at all, or whether it is a mere trick by which the inhabitant of Cheapside may be sacrificed to the inhabitant of Mark-lane, but without the slightest tendency to make the city more able for defence than it was before this notable invention was originated. This makes the real difficulty of the case. They may deprive the fund-holders of their tails tomorrow; and they will not be an atom stronger, or intrinsically more capable of defence than they were before. There is but one way to walk out of the dilemma, and that is by removing the Corn Laws; but this would require peace, to produce its effect. From war therefore,—from anything like prolonged and extensive war,—the people of England are imperiously cut off. The question is not in the slightest degree whether they find it pleasant to acknowledge this, but whether it is true. They may begin if they like; but it is like starting on a voyage of discovery with a week's provisions in the hold. It has been declared in the House of Commons, that they might possibly support two campaigns; and who is to be foolish enough to "go out a gunning" upon the strength of two campaigns? Wait, good people, wait, till you can hold your own against your aristocracy at home, and then you may have some chance to get rich enough at some time to do mischief abroad. But till then, your appetites for mischief must all be chained; the most tempting of mischiefs may pass by your doors, and you must sit like the man in the scripture, who "looks at a virgin and sighs." This is what the "upper classes" have done for you. You might have been manufacturing for the whole Continent these fifteen years; but the "upper classes" did not like it, and made an Act of Parliament to hinder it. Of course you were loyal, and stood by the upper classes; and now the upper classes must stand by you, and be content to move forward when you are able to march. A laudable conclusion it would be, if you were to come to the end of the two campaigns which are in your body,—and find an Army of England on the heights of Bou-

logne, with an American and Combined squadron at the mouth of the Thames, making gentle references to the destruction of the bridge at Washington and the burning of the House of Congress. You have not been "*that*" gentle in your dealings with your fellow creatures, that should make you at all desirous of trusting to their tender mercies. You never saw a foreign regiment, with laurels in their caps and turkeys' heads peeping out of their haversacks, marching past Whitehall; and if you did, you would wish that all the men and women in the universal world had kings or no kings as they pleased, sooner than you had ever mixed yourselves up with such a miserable business. Depend on it there is not the remotest chance, that anything you can possibly get in your two campaigns, would pay for such a sight as this. All the Park and Tower guns in the world would be nothing to it. The memory of the march to Paris, would be like the recollections of claret in the gout. Washington would be a burthen to you, and Baltimore as it were sadness of heart. You have no notion what a bitter reckoning a French and an American grenadier would bring you to, if they should catch you after you have ceased to walk in the strength of your two campaigns. For common prudence' sake, have a thought; and do not let affection for the Holy Alliance, however holy, great, and good it may be, induce you to run your heads into what you are told plainly in the House of Commons you cannot carry on, if your enemies have common luck and common perseverance. And this is not saying that you could not defend yourselves at home. A man may be very well able to defend himself, and yet not be in a condition to go out upon a foray against his neighbours. Peace and honesty are cheap things, compared with the glory and the dignity of making your neighbours slaves.

But there is another reason more powerful than all; which is, that such a war would, at the very best, be fighting for the sake of cutting our own throats. It would be a war to support the aristocracy of other countries and of our own, in the very power it is our interest by all legitimate methods to diminish. It would virtually be a war for Corn Laws, and for Poor's Rates, and for Game Laws. It would be a war for the sake of insuring the prohibition of commerce, and the starving of the manufacturer. It would be a war for the purpose of postponing all chance of getting rid of the system which makes the working classes pay for the support of those who never work, through the intervention of bread taxes, and sugar taxes, and tea taxes, —of taxes in the East, and in the West, and in all that is between,—not imposed for the sake of defraying the public expenditure, but of causing certain proceeds, in ways more or less

direct, to find their way into the pockets of the favoured orders. Till within a few weeks, the people in France were holding their aristocracy at arm's length; and the odds seemed to be, —as was stated with all simplicity and integrity of purpose in an article on *Béranger**,—that France would be a republic with the Bourbons in the Tuileries. Since then, a change of the administration,—manifestly to the hearts' delight of the abettors of misgovernment at home,—has made it a question whether the latter part of the expectation shall be true. The aristocracy in France has once more set itself in opposition to the people; and, as far as can be foreseen, one or the other must have a durable triumph. It will never do, for the English aristocracy to have an experimental garden in France,—to have a place where they may try the growth of slips of monopoly and privilege abroad, and transport the results in full bearing to Kensington and Kew. It is bad enough to be obliged to combat their union and skill as it is; without allowing them this piece of subsidiary practice. The French, on their side, seem to have an equally clear vision of the nature of the favour that is intended them; and their press, at the head of which is the journal quoted in the next paragraph, is leaving no means untried to guard against the danger. The article entitled "*On the Charter as it would be under the Aristocracy*," is a proud specimen of the effect with which the French have studied the political institutions of their neighbours, and a cheering pledge of the benefits to be derived by both nations from mutual communication. In fact what a shocking thing it would be, to see the English system of aristocracy transplanted into a comparatively happy country like France. Alas for Jacques Bonhomme!—*experto crede*, he would dance no more. But providence has better things in view. The interest of both countries is, that France should be free and England free; and not France second slave, that England may be first. The new law of nations is, the general happiness; and the way to this, as in the case of individuals, is that nations should be independent and honest,—not linked in a common bond of feudal degradation.

† 'Il n'y a plus moyen de rétablir la servitude telle qu'elle existait aux beaux temps de la féodalité; si l'aristocratie restaurée tentait de se partager la population pour l'attacher à la glèbe, elle formerait une tentative qui serait plus dangereuse pour elle que pour la France.

---

* Westminster Review for January 1829. Art. XIII. (*p. 42 of this Vol.*)

† There is no possibility now, of re-establishing personal slavery as it existed in the good old times of the feudal system. If the restored aristocracy were to attempt to divide the population among themselves and reduce it to the condition of serfs attached to the soil, they would be making an experiment of more

Il n'est pas possible non plus de transformer la France en une propriété de famille, dont un prince auroit la disposition absolue, sous condition d'en partager les produits à ses courtisans. Le rétablissement du régime fondé par Louis XIV n'est pas moins impossible que celui du régime féodal. Il est un troisième système dont l'exécution est beaucoup plus praticable: c'est celui dont l'Angleterre nous offre le modèle, et que M. de Polignac vient tenter de réaliser; c'est l'asservissement et l'exploitation en masse de toutes les classes industrieuses par l'aristocratie, sous des formes et des noms constitutionnels.

Dans ce système que le gouvernement anglais entend à merveille, le pouvoir législatif appartient exclusivement aux membres de l'aristocratie; les fonctions publiques qui mènent aux honneurs et à la fortune, n'appartiennent qu'aux hommes investis du pouvoir législatif, à leurs enfans ou à leurs parens; et le peuple qui travaille est la propriété des fonctionnaires publics. L'aristocratie anglaise exploite les classes industrieuses avec beaucoup d'intelligence: elle leur laisse tous les moyens de produire des richesses; chacun des individus qui lui sont soumis peut choisir le métier qui lui semble le plus lucratif. Les atteintes individuelles, qui feraient disparaître les capitaux, et arrêteraient la production, sont réprimées. Les travailleurs ne sont ni gênés ni troublés dans leurs travaux; ils sont libres dans leur industrie et leur commerce comme des abeilles dans une ruche.

Mais cette liberté dans le travail ne profite pas plus aux classes industrieuses que ne profite aux abeilles le miel qu'elles amassent avec tant de soin. L'aristocratie, au moyen des impôts qu'elle seule a le privilége d'établir, absorbe la partie la plus considérable de leurs revenus, et les distribue sous des noms divers aux mem-

---

danger to themselves than to the country. It is equally impossible to turn France into a single family estate, of which the absolute disposal should be vested in a prince, upon condition of his sharing the proceeds with the attendants on his court. The re-establishment of the order of things which was founded by Louis the Fourteenth, would be just as impossible as that of the feudal state. There is a third system, which it would be much more practicable to put into execution than any of these. It is what England is offering us the model of, and M. de Polignac has just been trying to set in operation; namely, the system of making slaves and tools of all the working classes in a body by the higher orders, under constitutional forms and names.

In this system which the English government understands prodigiously well, the power of making the laws belongs exclusively to the members of the aristocracy; public situations which are the road to honours and fortune, fall to the share of nobody but those who are vested with the power of making the laws, their children, or relations; and the people, which does the work, is the property in fee of those who have the management of public affairs. The English aristocracy displays great intelligence in the way in which it accomplishes its ends with the working classes. It leaves them all the means for the production of wealth; and every one of the individuals under its influence may chuse the business by which he thinks he can get the most. All attempts on the security of individual property, which would only cause capital to disappear and hinder production, are completely put down. The people that work are neither hampered nor disturbed in their labours, but are as free in their industry and their commerce as bees in a hive.

The working classes however derive no more advantage in the end from this freedom in their operations, than the bees do from the honey they take so much pains to collect. The higher orders, through the medium of the taxes which they alone have the privilege of laying, soak up the greatest part of the

bres dont elle se compose. A proprement parler, le parlement anglais remplit l'office d'un siphon : il pompe les richesses produites par les classes laborieuses, et les fait passer dans les mains des familles aristocratiques. Mais comme il est une machine intelligente, il laisse aux hommes industrieux ce qui leur est nécessaire pour travailler toujours.

L'aristocratie anglaise laisse pénétrer dans les deux chambres quelques hommes populaires, et c'est dans l'intérêt de sa domination. Si les hommes au profit desquels la classe industrieuse est exploitée composaient exclusivement la législature, ils pourraient compromettre leur pouvoir en exigeant du peuple plus qu'il ne serait capable de payer. Les hommes populaires qui pénètrent dans les chambres ont soin de les avertir quand ils s'exposent à quelque danger. L'opposition, dans la machine du gouvernement, remplit l'office de la soupape de sûreté dans la machine à vapeur : elle n'en gêne pas l'action ; mais elle la conserve en laissant évaporer en vaine fumée une force qui pourrait la détruire.

L'exercice de la puissance aristocratique étant attaché à la possession de grandes propriétés territoriales, on conçoit que les cadets ne peuvent avoir aucune part dans les immeubles que leurs parens laissent en mourant. Les enfans d'une famille aristocratique tomberaient tous, en effet, dans les rangs vulgaires, s'ils partageaient par égales parts les biens de leurs parens. L'aîné retient donc pour lui seul les immeubles, auxquels est attaché l'exercice du pouvoir aristocratique et il se sert ensuite de ce pouvoir pour enrichir ses cadets aux dépens des classes industrieuses. On se trompe quand on s'imagine qu'en Angleterre tous les biens d'une famille aristocratique sont exclusivement dévolus à l'aîné : celui-ci prend, il est vrai, les propriétés immobilières, qui sont exclusivement dans le domaine de la famille ; mais les ca-

---

produce, and divide it under different names among the members of their body. To describe the thing properly, the English parliament performs the office of a pump ; it sucks up the wealth produced by the working classes, and turns it over into the hands of the families of the aristocracy. But as it is a machine that has a head and can think, it leaves the working people what is necessary for them to go on always working.

The English aristocracy allows a certain number of men from the ranks of the people to find their way into the two houses of parliament ; and it is for the interest of its supremacy that it should be so. If the body that makes the laws consisted entirely of the persons for whose advantage the industrious portion of the community is set to work, they might bring their power into peril by demanding of the people more than it was able to pay. The men from among the people, who find their way into parliament, take care to let them know when they are running into any danger. The opposition, in the machine of government, does the duty of the safety-valve in a steam-engine. It does not stop the motion ; but it preserves the machine, by letting off in harmless smoke the power that otherwise might blow it up.

The exercise of aristocratical power being attached to the possession of great landed property, it is easy to see that younger brothers can have no share in the real estates which may be left by their relatives at their decease. The descendants of an aristocratic family would in fact all sink into the ranks of the common people, if they were to divide what is left by their relations in equal shares. The eldest son therefore keeps to himself all the landed property, to which is attached the exercise of aristocratic power ; and then he makes use of this power to get money for his younger brothers, at the expense of the working classes. It is a mistake to imagine that in England all the property of a family in the higher orders goes exclusively to the eldest son. It is true he takes the landed property, which is exclusively the family estate. But the

dets ont pour eux des bénéfices ecclésiastiques richement dotés, des *sinécures* ou des emplois que le public est chargé de payer. Tous ces biens sont considérés comme le patrimoine de la famille; car, nous ne saurions trop le répéter, l'aristocratie met au rang de ses propriétés, non-seulement les terres qu'elle possède directement, mais aussi les classes industrieuses qu'elle impose comme il lui plaît et dont elle se partage les revenus.

L'aristocratie de la Grande-Bretagne, qu'il ne faut pas confondre avec le peuple anglais, *peuple taillé à merci et miséricorde*, ne permettra jamais que, dans aucun pays, les classes industrieuses n'appartiennent qu'à elles-mêmes, tant qu'elle aura le moyen de l'empêcher. Elle sent très-bien que son propre pouvoir sur les classes laborieuses des pays soumis à son empire ne sera hors de contestation que lorsque partout ailleurs les mêmes classes seront possédées par une famille ou par une caste. Aussi la voit-on, dans toutes les circonstances, faire cause commune avec la barbarie contre la civilisation. Elle prend parti pour l'Autriche contre l'Italie, pour don Miguel contre don Pedro, pour les Turcs contre les Grecs. Si quelquefois elle paraît se prononcer pour les défenseurs de la liberté, ce n'est que pour s'emparer de la direction de leurs affaires et les livrer à leurs ennemis. Partout, en un mot, où elle aperçoit quelques germes de liberté, elle accourt pour les corrompre ou les étouffer.

Si nous jugeons des projets du ministère Polignac par les antécédens des hommes dont il se compose, et par les révélations des journaux du ministère anglais, nous pouvons savoir d'avance quelle est la transformation que la charte est destinée à subir entre leurs mains. Les Français seront égaux devant la loi, quels que soient d'ailleurs leurs titres et leurs rangs; mais la masse de la population sera frappée

---

younger brothers have for their share rich livings in the church, sinecures or places of some kind which the public is obliged to pay for; and all these are considered as part of the family property, as much as the other. For there never can be too much pains taken to impress the fact, that the higher orders consider themselves as having a property, not only in the landed estates which they possess by direct title, but in the working classes besides, on whom they lay taxes as they please, and share the proceeds among themselves.

The higher orders in Great Britain (who must not be confounded with the English people, *a people who are at their mercy to take what toll they please,*) will never allow the working classes in any country to be their own masters, as long as they can do anything to hinder it. They know very well that their own power over the working classes in the countries under their control will never be out of danger of being disputed, till the working classes in all other countries too, are made the property of a family or of a caste. And hence it is that they are found on all occasions making common cause with barbarism against civilization. They take the part of Austria against Italy, Don Miguel against Don Pedro, and the Turks against the Greeks. If they ever make a show of declaring for the defenders of freedom, it is only to get hold of the direction of their affairs, and hand them over to their enemies. Any-where and every-where, in short, where they espy the seeds of anything like liberty, they hurry off to spoil or smother them.

If we judge of the plans of the Polignac ministry by the past proceedings of the individuals that compose it, and by what is let out by the papers in the service of the English ministry, it is easy to tell what kind of transformation the Charter is intended to undergo in their hands. All Frenchmen will be equal in point of law, whatever in other respects their titles or their rank; but the great mass of the population will be stricken with political incapacity, and all public

d'incapacité politique, et tous les pouvoirs publics appartiendront à l'aristocratie. Ils contribueront indistinctement, dans la proportion de leur fortune, aux charges de l'état; mais les membres de l'aristocratie reprendront, sous le nom de pensions ou d'appointemens, la portion qu'ils auront payée, et se partageront le reste. Ils seront tous également *admissibles* aux emplois civils et militaires; mais ils ne seront réellement *admis* que, sous le bon plaisir de l'aristocratie, et pour seconder ses desseins. Leur liberté individuelle leur sera garantie; personne ne pourra être arrêté ni poursuivi que dans les cas et selon les termes que l'aristocratie aura déterminés. Chacun professera sa religion avec une égale liberté et obtiendra pour son culte la même protection, et néanmoins nul ne pourra manifester une opinion qui serait contraire aux croyances de l'église romaine. Les Français auront le droit de publier et de faire imprimer leurs opinions, à charge par eux de ne rien dire de contraire aux intérêts de l'église et de l'aristocratie. Enfin, toutes les propriétés seront inviolables, et néanmoins l'aristocratie pourra les soumettre toutes à telles contributions qu'elle jugera convenables, et s'en attribuer ainsi les revenus.

Telle est la charte que donnerait à la France le ministère Polignac, s'il parvenait à se former une majorité dans les chambres, et à obtenir le consentement du Roi. C'est aux électeurs à voir s'il leur convient de s'accommoder d'un tel régime: leur sort est entre leurs mains.'—DE LA CHARTE SELON L'ARISTOCRATIE. *Constitutionnel du 4 septembre*, 1829.

Nothing can be more correct and forcible than this statement of the working of the system it is desired to introduce into France. Its effect here has been to reduce the industrious classes to a state of suffering such as was perhaps never exhibited before in any country. Though the English people have

---

power will belong to the aristocracy. They will all contribute indiscriminately, in proportion to their property, to the expenses of the state; but the members of the aristocracy will take back again, under the name of pensions or of salaries, the portion that they have paid, and divide the rest among themselves besides. They will all be equally *admissible by law* to both civil offices and military; but there will be nobody *really admitted*, except at the good pleasure of the aristocracy, and to serve its purposes. Personal liberty will be guaranteed to everybody; and nobody will be seized or prosecuted but in the ways and terms the aristocracy has fixed upon. Every man will have equal liberty to profess his religion, and receive the same protection for his forms of worship; only nobody must utter any opinion that may be contrary to the tenets of the church of Rome. Everybody in France will have a right to publish and print his thoughts; at his own risk if he says anything that is against the interests of the church and the aristocracy. To wind up all, property of all kinds will be quite secure; only the aristocracy will have the power of laying it under any contributions they think proper, and so applying it to their own use.

This is the sort of Charter the Polignac ministry would bestow on France, if it succeeded in getting a majority in the chambers, and the king's consent. It is for the electors to consider whether they chuse to put up with such an order of things. Their fate is in their own hands.'—*From the* CONSTITUTIONNEL *French newspaper, of the 4th Sept.* 1829.

(This article in the Constitutionnel was by the regretted M. Comte; and is a specimen of the advantages which may be derived from the co-operation of liberal writers in different countries. Among other marks of the attention it excited, Mr. Cobbett republished both the original and the translation in his "Political Register," 16 *Jan.* 1830.—*Added in* 1839.

no particular claim upon the friendship of the French, they may be permitted to stretch out their hands to them and beg like the rich man in the Gospel, that they will not increase their evils by "also coming into this place."

It will be urged on the subject of Belgium, that England is bound by treaty. The difficulty certainly demands attention. If the foregoing representations are correct, it is the case of a nation bound by the act of past mis-governors, to the injury of its known interests. It is a case like that of the treaties of the Stuarts with a former Louis for the depression of Holland, for the sake of perpetuating the depression of liberty at home. And the question is, what is to be done with such a treaty, if the people come to a better mind. The best answer perhaps is, that it is not necessary to determine what shall be done, till, to quote the figure of the Turkish diplomatist, the babe is born and can be looked at. Innumerable chances may prevent its being ever necessary to answer the question at all. There may be nobody to call for the fulfillment; or there may be a refusal in the other contracting powers to fulfill their parts first; or there may be a physical impossibility for our portion being fulfilled. All agreements are subject to the contingency of their accomplishment being possible. It would be curious to know what a congregation of despots would say to such an announcement, as that the English Tories were ready to fulfill the agreements of Lord Castlereagh to the letter, provided said despots would show them the means of getting sixpence from the people of England towards doing it.

Postscript. 30 Aug. 1830.

(From the Republication in form of a Pamphlet, which took place on the news of the movement in Belgium begun at Brussells Aug. 25.)

The crisis which everybody knew must arrive, is come. The Belgic departments of France, which were taken from her on the same grounds and for the same reasons that the Holy Alliance of the time of William III might have occupied Devonshire and Cornwall, are in arms; and whatever intermediate course the struggle may take, no man doubts that their final object will be to get rid of the government of foreigners, and effect their junction with their countrymen. The case will then be the same, as if Devonshire and Cornwall had risen to rejoin themselves to England, after being separated from it as above. The question is, whether Englishmen are to give their money and persons to fight the battle of the Holy Alliance in such a cause; after the Bourbons, in support of whom the treaties re-

lating to Belgium were made, have by the recognition of all orders of men in England from the king upon the throne to the poorest artisan, broken their part of the agreement to begin with. The treaty made by Castlereagh, was in itself a breach of the compact of 1688; and it is fortunate that the breach has been soldered, by the accession of a king whom the people of England would put on the throne tomorrow if it was to be done *de novo*. The minister who made that treaty, as is well known, is past being called to an account; and any minister who should propose to act upon it after the dissolution of the *casus fœderis* by the voluntary misconduct of the Bourbons, would in all probability soon find himself in the situation of Polignac. If the money of the English people has been expended on the Belgian frontier, there is only the more reason why that frontier should not be applied to purposes hostile to their interests. The interest of the English people at this moment is, that France should be, not weakened, but strengthened; and the interest of their foreign and domestic enemies is the contrary. The liberty of France is the outpost of liberty in England; and if Belgium is necessary to strengthen that outpost, the people of England will support a war to give it, rather than to prevent it from being taken.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 October, 1829.

ART. XVI.—*Edinburgh Review, No. XCVIII, Art.* 1. *On the Answer of the Westminster Review to the Article on "Utilitarian Logic and Politics."*

WHEN a thoughtless little boy makes an unadvised assault upon the venerable father of the flock, and is rolled in the dust for his reward, he runs to his mamma and complains of a "very unfair attack upon ourselves." Of this kind has been the deportment of the Edinburgh Reviewers, in pursuance of their inconsiderate molestation of Mr. Bentham and his followers. Nor does their ill-humour seem to have been diminished by discovering, that there had been no occasion for the principal to appear at all,—that he can do things of this kind by his journeymen*. They took for granted that the prophet must come forth, and curse them by his gods; instead of which,

* If by "puffs and placards" the Edinburgh Reviewers meant the advertisement in the newspapers and the booksellers' bills into which it was copied, the description of the Article they allude to ran as follows, which certainly announces nothing like what they have assumed.

'XVI. GREATEST-HAPPINESS PRINCIPLE DEVELOPED.—With Mr. BENTHAM'S latest improvements, now published for the first time; and an Answer to the attacks of the Edinburgh Review.'

one of his disciples poured out the prophetic wash-pot on the heads of the assailants. As is usual on such occasions, they give more voice to their irritation than is politic or wise. They stand pointing to the unlucky inverter of earthen-ware, and call the neighbourhood to witness that "their civilities were not meant for *him*." It is quite a mistake of their own, if they think they have been civil to anybody. They began with being petulant, and ended with being silly. They walked out of the common path of courtesy, to mock at an individual whom it now suits them to allow to be "illustrious" and "great;" and if they have received a rebutter for their pains, they must ascribe it to the fatality which prompted them to folly, taking advantage of the absence of their good genius in the person of their *bonne*.

It matters very little whether the "blue and yellow" rag or the "whity-brown" is last upon the field; but it matters very much that an opportunity should not be lost of exposing the sleights of the *aristocrates en carmagnole*, who pretend to court the people when they have anything to gain by it, and spurn them as "the ranks and the rabble*" when they have not. To make this exposure was the object of the rebutter; and not to determine whether the Essay on Government was perfect. In fact it was expressly said, that it contained much that was right, and something that was wrong; and that the Reviewers had attacked the first, and let alone the other. The design was not to prove the original a master-piece of demonstration, but the comment a master-piece of insincerity.

The first extract given by the Edinburgh Reviewers from the Essay was an insulated passage, purposely despoiled of what had preceded and what followed. The author had been observing, that "some profound and benevolent investigators of human affairs had adopted the conclusion, that of all the possible forms of government, absolute monarchy is the best." This is what the Reviewers have omitted at the beginning. He then adds, as in the extract, that "Experience, *if we look only*

---

* —'as we have no heroes and statesmen chosen from the ranks and the rabble,'—*Edinburgh Review, No. XCVIII*, p. 333.

These are the men who profess to do everything "*for* the people," nothing "*by* the people;" and who are at this moment pushing a not over wise government into persecution of the press. If Tories are to be put down for speaking their minds, there is an end of the liberty of speech for all and everybody. There have been great soldiers in England, who scorned to flinch at paper bullets thus. If somebody has said the Guards marched three deep upon the pavement and we have a military government, why is not the corporal called to prove that they did not? No government prosecutes, except under the impression of there being something it cannot confute;—with the single further reservation, of being put upon it by somebody who wants to take the opportunity of depressing those he is not a match for in fair debate.

at the outside of the facts, appears to be divided on this subject;" there are Caligulas in one place, and Kings of Denmark in another. "As the surface of history affords, therefore, no certain principle of decision, *we must go beyond the surface*, and penetrate to the springs within." This is what the Reviewers have omitted at the end. The author's argument was, that when facts are not such that the causes are determinable by simple inspection, it is necessary to go deeper, and look for some more complex causes that may account for the whole. And the conclusion to which the author came was the very reasonable one, that there was a general principle, and when it appeared not to act, it was because it was overpowered by some force in an opposite direction. To take an instance in natural phænomena, there are many bodies that fall towards the earth, but there are some that ascend and go from it. From simple inspection of these facts, therefore, no conclusion can be derived. But by looking a little deeper into the experience of mankind it is discoverable, that all bodies have a tendency to fall, and when they do not it is because this tendency is overpowered by another force. The conclusion which the author in like manner deduced from experience was, that absolute monarchy tends to misgovernment, and would always arrive at it, "*if checks did not operate in the way of prevention**." What the Reviewers object to, is the going beyond the surface. Because an inference cannot be derived from the outside of the facts, they desire to have no inference at all. They have a wish that the thing should be unsettled; because they see no prospect of a settlement that accords with their interest. Whether the inference deduced is right, is a matter for after consideration; what is plain in the present stage is, that the objections of the Reviewers are without foundation. "*Mr. Mill gave it as a reason for deducing the theory of government from the general laws of human nature, that the king of Denmark was not Caligula.*" A natural philosopher gave it as a reason for deducing the theory of moving bodies from the general laws of external nature, that some move upwards and some downwards. "This," say the Edinburgh Reviewers, "we said, and still say, was absurd."

When it was said by Mr. Mill that the people of Denmark resolved that their king should be "absolute," it clearly meant that he should be absolute in form. When it was said by the Westminster Review that the king of Denmark "is not a despot," it as clearly meant, that though absolute in form,

* Essay on Government. Supp. to Encycl. Brit. Vol. IV. p. 496.

there was a virtual check on his being despotic in practice. It would be a foolish difficulty to insist upon referring to Mr. Bentham.

When it was said that there was in Denmark a balanced contest between the king and the nobility, what was said was, that there was a balanced contest but it did not last. It was balanced till something put an end to the balance; and so is everything else. That such a balance will not last, is precisely what Mr. Mill had demonstrated.

When Mr. Mill asserted that it cannot be for the interest of either the monarchy or the aristocracy to combine with the democracy, it is plain he did not assert that if the monarchy and aristocracy were in doubtful contest with each other, they would not either of them accept of the assistance of the democracy. He spoke of their taking the side of the democracy; not of their allowing the democracy to take side with themselves.

Mr. Mill never asserted "*that under no despotic government does any human being, except the tools of the sovereign, possess more than the necessaries of life, and that the most intense degree of terror is kept up by constant cruelty.*" He said that absolute power leads to such results, "by infallible sequence, where power over a community is attained, *and nothing checks**." The critic on the Mount never made a more palpable misquotation.

The spirit of this misquotation runs through every part of the reply of the Edinburgh Review that relates to the Essay on Government; and is repeated in as many shapes as the Roman pork. The whole description of "Mr. Mill's argument against despotism,"—including the illustration from right-angled triangles and the square of the hypothenuse,—is founded on this invention of saying what an author has not said, and leaving unsaid what he has.

The reply to the argument against "saturation," supplies its own answer. The reason why it is of no use to try to "saturate," is precisely what the Edinburgh Reviewers have suggested, "*that there is no limit to the number of thieves.*" There are the thieves and the thieves' cousins,—with their men-servants, their maid-servants, and their little ones, to the fortieth generation. It is true that "a man cannot become a king or a member of the aristocracy whenever he chuses;" but if there is to be no limit to the depredators except their own inclination to increase and multiply, the situation of those who are to suffer is as wretched as it needs be. It is impossible to define what *are* "corporal pleasures." A Duchess of Cleveland was a "cor-

* Essay on Government. Supp. to Encycl. Brit. Vol. IV. p. 495.

poral pleasure." The most disgraceful period in the history of any nation,—that of our Restoration,—presents an instance of the length to which it is possible to go in an attempt to "saturate" with pleasures of this kind*.

When the Edinburgh Reviewers declare that though "they said there is a *certain* check to the rapacity and cruelty of men in their desire of the good opinion of others, they never said it was *sufficient*,"—it may be left to the public opinion whether this is not simple quibbling. What is a *certain* check, but a check that is sufficient to a certain extent for a certain purpose?

'*The argument in favour of kings and nobles is this:—they will not wrong the people, because they care for the good opinion of the people.*' A man will not beat his wife, because he cares for the good opinion of his wife.—But a man who beats his wife, cares nothing for her good opinion. Let experience determine, whether there are men who beat their wives or not.

Nobody ever said that "men will necessarily prefer the pleasures of oppression to those of popularity." What was said was, that the desire of popularity is no sufficient security against oppression.

That no man cares for the good opinion of those he has been accustomed to wrong, instead of being a "too sweeping position," is almost a truism;—for if he cared for their good opinion, it is plain he would cease to wrong.

'*That some men will plunder their neighbours if they can, is a sufficient reason for the existence of governments. But it is not demonstrated that kings and aristocracies will plunder the people, unless it be true that all men will plunder their neighbours if they can.*' And thence it is inferred, that if it is held proved that kings and aristocracies will plunder the people, it follows that in a democracy men will plunder their neighbours. The argument is, that because the aristocracy will plunder the people, the *people* will plunder the people. There is no congruity between the things produced as similar.

'*They never alluded to the French Revolution for the purpose of proving that the poor were inclined to rob the rich.*'—They only said, "as soon as the poor *again* began to compare their cottages and salads with the hotels and banquets of the rich, there would have been another scramble for property, another general confiscation," &c. It is denied as before, that

---

* It was found on one occasion, that nearly half the money that had been voted for the Dutch war, had gone to the "corporal pleasures" of The Most Religious and Gracious King.—*See Pepys's Diary, A.D. 1666, Sept. 23 and Oct. 10.*

they *ever* compared,—that there *ever* was either a general confiscation or a scramble for property at all.

The fallacy that "*if Mr. Mill's reasoning à priori be sound, the people in a democracy will plunder the rich,*" depends on omitting the qualifying clause "*if nothing checks.*" History and experience prove, that the love of individuals for property is always sufficient to unite a sufficient number of individuals to prevent the pillage of the rich. History and experience prove, that the love of individuals for property is very generally insufficient to prevent the pillage of the poor.

The assertion—or intimation—or inclination to think,—that "it would on the whole be for the interest of the majority to plunder the rich," was never met by a "*simple assertion.*" It was met by the argument, that such an act would amount to a declaration that nobody should be rich, and that as all men desire to be rich, it would involve the destruction of their own hopes, and therefore would not be attempted. It may be referred to the common judgment of mankind, whether this is not the principle which makes ninety-nine men out of a hundred abstain from picking pockets, and discountenance it in others. Some perplexity is attempted to be got up, between the interest of the existing generation and the interest of future ones. Men do not set themselves against picking pockets for the love of future generations, but of their own.

What was said in the Westminster Review on the subject of "levelling," does not appear to have been understood. It was not stated that "the wish has been put forward as a blind," on the part of the people, to conceal some other design; but that "levelling is brought forward as the blind," by the accusers of the people, to conceal the fact that the real cause of the commotion was the desire to escape from oppression.

It was never said, that there was no difference between the practical quantity of theft in different places; but "that numbers of men had a propensity to thieving, and the business of the officers was to catch them." The mis-statement is a branch of the suppression of all mention of the check. By putting the extract from the Edinburgh Review into the mouth of the Whiggery of Bow-street, it was intended to show that all this *verbiage* was nothing but what everybody knew, and everybody acted upon;—that it was precisely by the operations described, that men knew there were thieves, and to watch them was the way to hinder them;—and that the wordy enumeration was brought there only to puzzle the question, and make a diversion from the truth. The aim and object of the Edinburgh Reviewers was to prove, "that the theory of government is to be deduced from experience;" which is exactly

the quarter where Mr. Mill had looked for it. They will perhaps blush at the idea of having meant so much; but, with characteristic policy, they have inserted their meaning in their postscript*.

The quotations from Lord Bacon are misapplications, such as anybody may make to anything he dislikes. There is no more resemblance between pain, pleasure, motives &c., and *substantia, generatio, corruptio, elementum, materia*,—than between lines, angles, magnitudes &c., and the same.

The Edinburgh Reviewers "*never said a syllable against the "greatest-happiness principle;*"—only they say that it is good for nothing. They never meant to deny it, any more than "*to deny the unity of God;*" only the unity is a truism of which nobody can make any use. All that they have established is, that they do not understand it. Instead of the truism of the Whigs, "that the greatest happiness is the greatest happiness," —what Mr. Bentham had demonstrated, or at all events had laid such foundations that there was no trouble in demonstrating, was that the greatest happiness of the individual was in the long run to be obtained by pursuing the greatest happiness of the aggregate†. It was an extension of the ancient proverb, that honesty is the best policy. There are men who think honesty is *not* the best policy in private life, and who think in the same way with relation to politics and international law; and the corollary from Mr. Bentham's principles demonstrated that these are the fools, and the others are the wise. The inefficient attempts which had been made for the explanation of moral and political phenomena, were superseded by a clearer clue, in the same manner as the epicycles and *abhorret vacuum* of the early ages were swept away by the discovery of the principle of gravitation. The comparison to gravitation is therefore accurate and just‡.

'*Does Mr. Bentham profess to hold out any new motive which may induce men to promote the happiness of the species to which they belong? Not at all.*'—The motive which Mr.

---

* Ed. Rev. No. XCVIII, Index, p. 542; at the end of the article *Mill.*

† See 'Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation.' Chap. XVII. Sect. VI and VII.

‡ 'Some, indeed, may imagine, that there was no such extraordinary merit as is generally supposed even in the grand conjecture of Newton, and that it amounted, after all, merely to the application of a law to the movements of the heavenly bodies, which was already known to affect at least every body in the immediate neighbourhood of the earth. But these things are only simple after they are explained. Slight and transparent as we may think the veil to have been which covered the truths alluded to, and others of a similar nature, immediately before they were detected, it is yet an unquestionable fact, that this veil had been sufficient to conceal them, for thousands of years, from the observation of all the world.'—*Library of Entertaining Knowledge*, Vol. iii. Part I. p. 9.

Bentham's principle holds out, is the same as the motive to personal honesty; namely, that the conduct which leads to the greatest happiness of the aggregate, is in the end the soundest policy for the individual. To those who have not found this out before, such a motive is a "new motive."

'*He distinctly admits that, if he is asked why government should attempt to produce the greatest possible happiness, he can give no answer.*'—Nothing of the kind will be admitted at all. In the passage thus selected to be tacked to the other, the question started was concerning "the object of government;" in which government was spoken of as an operation, not as anything that is capable of feeling pleasure or pain. In this sense it is true enough, that *ought* is not predicable of governments. *Other men*, only meant men who are suffering from the operation, in contradistinction to those who are conducting it. At the same time the double meaning of the word government was not got clear of without confusion. It is certain that the individual operators in any government, if they were thoroughly intelligent and entered into a perfect calculation of all existing chances, would seek for their own happiness in the promotion of the general; which brings them, if they knew it, under Mr. Bentham's rule. The mistake of supposing the contrary, lies in confounding criminals who have had the luck to escape punishment, with those who have the risk still before them. Suppose, for instance, a member of the House of Commons were at this moment to debate within himself, whether it would be for his ultimate happiness to begin, according to his ability, to misgovern. If he could be sure of being as lucky as some that are dead and gone, there might be difficulty in finding him an answer. But he is *not* sure; and never can be, till he is dead. He does not know that he is not close upon the moment, when misgovernment such as he is tempted to contemplate, will be made a terrible example of. It is not fair to pick out the instance of the thief that has died unhanged. The question is whether thieving is at this moment an advisable trade to begin, with all the possibilities of hanging not got over. This is the spirit of Mr. Bentham's principle; and if there is anything opposed to it in any former statement, it may be corrected by the present. But all this only proves that the members of a government would do well if they were all-wise, or had that perfect apprehension of all the risks they run, which is lacking in the thief. But the whole of human experience proves, that they are *not* all-wise; but on the contrary do invariably sacrifice a certain portion of contingent safety to the prospect of present gain, in the hope that punishment will not fall personally upon themselves. The punish-

ment comes down every now and then on some luckless set of governors, in the shape of resistance or a revolution. It is not equally divided among all the sinners; but all the sinners run the chance, and it is the existence of this chance at any given moment, which makes the misconduct veritably unwise. At the same time the proving the misconduct to be veritably unwise, is in no shape in opposition with the fact, that experiment demonstrates that all governments *do* run into such misconduct, except so far as they see very prompt and immediate symptoms of danger. They all steal, till they can see the noose with their bodily eyes; and the practical and substantial interest of the public is to take care, that this most salutary vision shall in a more or less remote form be ever present to their sight.

'*The principle of Mr. Bentham, if we understand it, is this, that mankind ought to act so as to produce their greatest happiness.*' It is plain that "we" do *not* understand it; and "the ranks and the rabble" do. The *vis* of Mr. Bentham's principle was, that individuals, societies, nations, would in the end increase their particular stock of happiness, by taking the road which leads to the happiness of the aggregate, instead of the road which appears to lead to their own at the expense of the aggregate,—and therefore ought to take this road, though they do not.

'*But, if what a man thinks his happiness be inconsistent with the greatest happiness of mankind, will this new principle convert him to another frame of mind?*' It will, if it persuades him that he is a fool to think so.

It is undeniably true, that everything is capable of being applied to a bad use. It is possible to imagine a heretic burnt on pretence of "the greatest-happiness principle," as well as on pretence of the love of God. The planter and the military flogger avow boldly, that flogging is the greatest happiness. But their misfortune is, that notwithstanding their attempt to misapply, the principle on the whole has made it vastly more difficult either to burn or to flog than before. For one man that has been taken in by the misapplication, fifty have been strengthened in their conviction of the truth.

'*We should very much like to know how the Utilitarian principle would run, when reduced to one plain imperative proposition.*'—It would run thus—"Pursue the rule which is best for the general happiness; because, in the long run and taking all the chances that are before you together, it is the most likely to increase your own."

'*Will it run thus—pursue your own happiness? This is superfluous. Every man pursues it, according to his light,*

and always has pursued it, and always must pursue it. To say that a man has done anything, is to say that he thought it for his happiness to do it.'—It will run thus—Pursue your own happiness *aright.* The precept is not "Do what you may *think* for your happiness;" but "Do thus and thus, and it will *be* for your happiness." The man who steals, does what he thinks for his happiness. The object of the precept and its accompaniment, is to persuade him that he is mistaken.

'*Will the principle run thus—pursue the greatest happiness of mankind, whether it be your own greatest happiness or not? This is absurd and impossible.*'—Present greatest-happiness is here confounded with ultimate; which in fact constitutes the error of all immorality. The man who takes a purse, pursues his greatest happiness in the sense of the Edinburgh Reviewers. The precept says, "Pursue the rule which tends to the greatest general happiness, in preference to *this* greatest-happiness, and the chances are, you will be the better for it in the end." There is a momentary interest and a final one; an apparent interest and a real one; and what is desired is to persuade men to take the one and not the other.

'*The "greatest-happiness principle" has always been latent under the words, social contract, justice, benevolence, patriotism, liberty, and so forth, just as far as it was for the happiness, real or imagined, of those who used these words to promote the greatest happiness of mankind. And of this we may be sure, that the words "greatest happiness" will never, in any man's mouth, mean more than the greatest happiness of others which is consistent with what he thinks his own.*'—The question was not what would be in any man's mouth. There are people every-where, into whose mouths there is no putting any good. But the question was, whether a dangerous light was not thrown upon the way for men to promote their interest in concert; and whether the good would not on the whole be assisted by it, and the bad depressed and kept in check, in the same manner that has been the consequence of the demonstration of the individual policy of honesty.

'*What society wants is a new motive—not a new cant.*'—Society has got the motive; and those that fear it, find the cant.

The next objection is, considering the quarter from which it comes, a remarkable one. It is no less than that Mr. Bentham's principle "is included in the Christian morality." Nobody ever thought of denying, that the author of Christianity was the first of Utilitarians. But the world at large is not so decided in its submission to the sanctions of theology, as to make it a trifling service to have demonstrated the grounds on which

any given precept is recommended by men's present interests. The Holy Alliance may profess to govern by the rules of Christianity; but large portions of mankind think it quite as well to inquire whether the interpretation agrees with their temporal interests besides. If the discoveries of worldly philosophy agree with the precepts of Christianity, it is a triumph for the latter. The precept had been uttered of "Thou shalt not steal," and Christianity had given it the sanction of its hopes and fears; but nobody ever conceived there was any harm in demonstrating to individuals in all manner of earthly ways besides, that it was much the best for them on the whole that they should not steal. In the same manner Mr. Bentham has demonstrated that for individuals, societies, nations, to "do as they would be done by," is sound earthly policy. The bigots keep a close lock on their Elysium; but whenever the time comes for the *second* Utilitarian to present himself at the gate, it is presumable the *first* will not wait for their leave, to greet him with "Well done."

Where so much real service has been derived from the agitation of a question, it would be ingratitude to conclude with anything approaching to the ill-humour of the little codicillular appendage of the Edinburgh Reviewers. Another time, they are intreated not to do anything like checking their thunder in mid volley; but freely pour out the vials of their wrath, that all men may be convinced that there was something in the bottle.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 October, 1829.

Notice on the subject of Free Trade.

An article on Free Trade would have been given in the present Number, with a reference to the Speech of Mr. Sadler at Whitby which appears to be the novelty of the day, if the printing of the Number had not been already completed. In the next it is intended that the Speech should receive such attention as its relative importance three months hence may appear to demand. All that there is an opportunity of doing at present, is to refer for the answers to it, to pages 21, 22, and 23, of the "Catechism on the Corn Laws." The system defended by Mr. Sadler, amounts only to a proposal to rob one set of manufacturers or tradesmen to please another; with the ultimate purpose of withdrawing the attention of the whole from the great robbery of all, which is the Corn Laws. If foreign goods are to be prohibited, the trades that supply the articles which directly or indirectly go to pay the foreigners, must

stop; it is therefore only a plan for enriching one kind of tradesmen at the expense of another. If Rochdale, Manchester, and Barnsley are starving, it is because Rochdale, Manchester, and Barnsley are not allowed to sell their manufactures for corn. Mr. Sadler calls upon "Him who giveth food for all flesh, for his mercy endureth for ever,"—and then goes to parliament for an Act to prevent the men of Manchester from selling their goods for corn.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 January, 1830.

ART. VII.—1. *The speech of Michael T. Sadler, Esq. M.P. on the State and Prospects of the Country; delivered by him at Whitby, on Tuesday, Sept.* 15, 1829, *at a Public Dinner given to him by the Merchants, Ship-owners and Ship-builders, of that place.*—London. Seeley. pp. 35.

2. *The Condition of the Empire.*—Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, for July 1829.

"THE monkeys in Exeter Change used to be confined in a row "of narrow cages, each of which had a pan in the centre "of its front for the tenant's food. When all the monkeys were "supplied with their messes, it was observable that scarcely any "one of them ate of his own pan. Each thrust his arm through "the bars, and robbed his right or left hand neighbour. "Half what was so seized was spilt and lost in the conveyance; "and while one monkey was so unprofitably engaged in plun-"dering, his own pan was exposed to similar depredation. The "mingled knavery and absurdity was shockingly human*."

Take now the case which the opponents of Free Trade would put forward as most favourable to their cause; and see if it amounts to anything but this monkey policy in the end. Assume, for instance, the case of the glove-maker. Gloves may be had, it shall be supposed, from a French maker for the value of two shillings a pair. An Englishman stands up and says, that he can make gloves of the same kind for three shillings; and therefore, for the sake of encouraging British commerce, it is expedient to pass a law to prohibit the introduction of French gloves at two shillings, in order that those who chuse to wear gloves may be obliged to take them from the Englishman at three.

Never mind what quantity of flourishes the supporters of the legerdemain may make to cover the performance. Let it be

---

* Examiner, Oct. 4, 1829.

utterly indifferent to you, what names, sacred or profane, they invoke to give gravity to their proceedings. If they are poetical, think of the Rule of Three. If they quote scripture, take care of your pockets. Your money, which is your life, is at stake; therefore keep a cool head and a clear eye. The army of thimble-men from Doncaster is upon you; and there is no yeomanry at hand to clear the course. Trust no man that looks like a conjuror: be upon your guard also against those that do not. Beware of the quack doctors, who make long speeches; they will "ravish you if they get you into their net." Say like Mr. Sadler, that "all men are liars;" and you will not be very far from being right. Believe nobody, nothing,—except that two and two make four. If an angel or an archbishop preach anything contrary to this, give them no heed. If judges on the bench contradict it, tell them they sit there to make law and not arithmetic. You have money; and therefore everybody is in a plot against you. There is something in your pockets; and you will be beset right and left, till they are cleaned out.

When you buy a pair of French gloves, it is clear that they are paid for in something. You have the substantial evidence that *you* did not get them for nothing; and so has everybody else. They must have been paid for either with goods of English produce, or with goods of some kind (gold and silver included) which have been bought from abroad with goods of English produce, or with bills which are only an order for payment in one of the other ways a few days hence instead of to-day. Unless an Englishman has the art of getting anything for nothing, in one or other of these ways must they infallibly have been paid for. Here, then, are at all events two shillings accounted for out of the three; which are as fairly expended for the benefit of British producers and manufacturers of some kind, as they would be if the gloves were bought from a British glove-maker at the same price. They are paid for to the Frenchman in, it may be, Sheffield goods. But if the glove-maker procures a law that gloves shall not be bought from France, it is plain that Sheffield goods must stop. The glove-maker may gain employment and trade to the amount of two shillings; but it is equally plain that the Sheffield-man must lose it.

So much for the part which consists of the *two* shillings. Next for the part which consists of the other *one*. And this, says the glove-maker, is to be a clear gain to British commerce, and it is a horrible wrong if it is deprived of it. Now mark the juggle; look sharply to the shuffling of the balls. If the wearer of gloves is to be forced to expend a shilling more upon

the glove-maker, he must expend a shilling less upon somebody else. It may be that he would not have expended it at Sheffield, but at Birmingham; or that it would have been divided among fifty other places which it is impossible to assign by name. But still it is as clear as ever, that the shilling which it is proposed to make him expend *nolens volens* upon the glove-maker, must be taken from the custom of some other British manufacturers somehow and somewhere. There is no deception arising from the payments being made in money; if instead of shillings they were made with pecks of wheat, it would be just as true that the third peck which the glove-maker demands a law to put into his own pot, must be taken from the pudding of some British manufacturer, to whom it would otherwise have gone. Sift this; turn it over; see if it be true or not. Do not allow yourself to be tamely taken in, because the men who try to do it wear good clothes. Either it is true or it is not. If it is not true, let somebody show where it is false. Till then, take leave to account it correct.

Here, then, are the whole three shillings perfectly accounted for. It is shown to be a hocus-pocus and a fraud,—that states that any gain arises to British commerce or production in the aggregate from the prohibition of the commerce in French gloves, or that any aggregate loss is induced by its absence. The whole amounts only to a plan for robbing a Sheffield man or a Birmingham, who can make what people will voluntarily buy, for the benefit of the glover who cannot;—for clipping the commerce of some individual who has ingenuity and skill enough to command a market, to add it to him who is without.

But this is not all; there is another count in the indictment. The consumer, the unfortunate who is in the habit of wearing gloves, is to be the gratuitous loser of a shilling besides. If the shilling was to go to the benefit of commerce, he might wrap himself up in his patriotism and be consoled. If it was really to cause any increase in the safety or strength of the community of which he is a member,—if the thousandth part of a farthing of it was to appear in the shape of national wealth, security, or splendour,—he might lay aside the feelings of an injured purchaser of mittens, and exult in his fractional portion of the glory of those who have suffered for their country. But when it is to be taken from him with no object, no prospect, no hope, but that a clumsy and inefficient artisan shall be enabled to appropriate the custom of an intelligent and effective one,—his situation presents itself in all its nakedness, his courage sinks under the view, the feelings of humanity prevail, he drops a tear and wipes it on his three-shilling gloves, and

sits down a melancholy monument of what it is to be "the envy of surrounding nations and the wonder of the world."

This is the examination of one single act; the next is to multiply the cases, as is the fact in nature. And here let your thoughts be upon monkeys, and the visions of your soul revert to Exeter Change. Suppose then that every individual in the community was a producer of some kind, and that every one had a "protection" upon his particular trade. What would be the result, but that each would steal something out of his neighbour's box, with a general loss to be divided among themselves in their character of consumers, equal to what might have been saved by buying goods of all kinds where they were cheapest? It is the monkeys all over; and the monkeys are the better of the two. They are the original inventors, and the other but a stupid copy. It is enough to put a man out of conceit with his humanity;—to make him wish for a tail, or sigh for a depression of the frontal bone.

But it will be said that this is not an exact statement of the case;—that all men are not producers, but on the contrary there are large classes that produce nothing. And hereupon it will be attempted to infer, that the whole is a patriotic machine for drawing wealth from the unproductive, and giving it to the industrious. There might be some show of reason in this argument, *if the industrious classes were to gain by it.* But the industrious are in the aggregate to gain nothing,—all that is to be given to one of them is to be taken from another; and the unproductive, as they are called, are to be robbed for love. A great proportion,—a large and important share of the sum thus stupidly thrown away,—must of necessity fall on the industrious; for though they do not consume all, they consume a great deal. And it is no remedy to *them,* that somebody else is to lose the rest. Besides this, the classes so unceremoniously voted unproductive, are in a very great measure composed of those who *have* produced. There is no reason in saying a man shall be protected while he is producing, but shall be robbed whenever he begins to enjoy. Men do not labour for the simple love of labour, but for the love of the enjoyment they may ultimately procure by it. No man in his senses would consent to an arrangement, by which he should be protected while he was a hard-working citizen, but should be exposed to all robberies whenever he had the impudence to think of retiring to live upon his savings. Yet this is the very theory of those who talk of robbing the unproductive with as much lightness of heart, as if men really produced and saved with no other view but that somebody else might take it from them.

It is clear, therefore, that what is really recommended, is to incur an assured loss in the aggregate; but men are exhorted to struggle and pull caps, for the chance of what they may individually get from others in the contest. That all the traders in a country, and all the inhabitants in general whether they trade or not, must lose by such a principle if the effects were evenly distributed, is as plain as in the case of a lottery; but they are to be cheered on by the probability that the distribution may *not* be even, and that they may be the lucky rogues who win. It is a political *little-go*, in which everybody knows the concern to be ruinous in the main; but jolter-headed individuals are to be encouraged to throw again, by the vision of some paltry prize they are to catch at the expense of the remainder.

If a saving is to be made by the introduction of steam-coaches, no effectual opposition can be offered by the dealers in horses; because the public are sufficiently informed to know, that all they expend less upon coach-hire will be expended upon something else instead, and therefore the loss of business to horse-dealers will be balanced by an increase of business of exactly the same amount to somebody and somewhere, and they (the public) will gain the difference besides. They have a perfect comprehension that to put down steam-coaches by act of parliament, would only be enacting that a quantity of employment and profits should be taken from certain dealers, for the sake of giving to horse-dealers the same quantity of employment and profits *and no more*, with the further addition of the loss to the coach-riding public of the whole difference of coach-hire besides. They see distinctly that to propose such a thing would be as great an absurdity and injustice, as to propose to enact that a carrier should not grease his wheels, for the sake of causing a greater quantity of horse-flesh to be charged to his customers. They are aware that such a piece of legislative dullness as this, would amount to setting up the principle that it was for the interest of everybody that everything should be done in the most bungling and round-about way possible; and that any pretence to increase national wealth or stave off national suffering by such processes, must be foolery or worse. All this they know, so long as none of the parties proposes to operate by the intervention of an exchange abroad. But let a single exchange intervene, and the question is too much for them. If the machine in which men are to ride for two shillings instead of three, can only be bought with Sheffield cutlery from France,—they are utterly unable to see, that the national profit by steam-riding,—the ultimate advantage of employing an English cutler to effect the production of the

cheap machine, instead of an English horse-dealer to supply the dear one,—is the same as ever. In this case they are ready to join the horse-dealer in begging, first, that the employment may be taken from the Sheffield cutlers; secondly, that it may be taken from the persons at present employed by the expenditure of the shillings of which it is proposed to rob the coach-riding public; and thirdly, that they the public may be robbed of a shilling in their coach-riding, without advantage in the aggregate to anybody. They can see that it would be absurd to put down the *Omnibus* on the ground that men rode cheaper in it; but they cannot see that if the Omnibus could only be got from France in exchange for Sheffield goods, the case would be unaltered. Was it rightly said, that John Bull is a man of one idea, or at most of two? And is there any reason why he should encourage himself in being a fool, for the benefit of those who pat him on the back that they may pick his pocket?

This may suffice for an introduction to the examination of the Whitby speech; which has been celebrated as containing an invincible statement of the reasons, why every monkey should be fed out of his neighbour's pan. That the reader may be fully acquainted with the circumstances in which the speech originated, he is informed, that on Tuesday, the 15th of September, 1829, a public dinner was given to the Member for Newark, "by the Merchants and Ship-owners of Whitby (Edward Chapman, Esq. in the Chair) in testimony of their approbation of his uniform and steady opposition to the pernicious and ruinous system of policy" (*meaning the efforts of Mr. Huskisson and others towards putting an end to the system of feeding aforesaid*), "under which the mercantile interests of England are at present suffering;" and that the following pages contain the substance of the speech delivered on that occasion.

'Gentlemen, the ancient and genuine policy of this great country (*of eating out of one another's pans*), like its constitution, was not, if I may so express myself, struck out at a heat. Dictated by necessity, and confirmed by experience, it was the work of successive generations,—generations of incomparably greater intellect [*as their mode of feeding testifies*], and, it is to be feared, of far more real patriotism, than the present. It was not suggested perhaps by hireling critics, or patronised by political pamphleteers,—but it had the deliberate sanction and suffrages of the most illustrious names that ever adorned England or the world.—such names as Bacon, as Locke, as Addison, whose authority gave it the signature of immortality,—men who brought to the consideration of the subject not only the broadest lights of reason, but the utmost warmth of benevolence, and who left nothing to be discovered, in the fundamental principles of human policy, to the witlings of the day, but the secret of their own conceited ignorance.'—p. 5.

No wise man burthens himself with the authority of antiquity. Either antiquity gave reasons for its opinions, or it did not. If it did, the fair way is to bring forward the reasons; and the writer who declines it, is suspected of not having them to bring. If it gave none, the very children in the schools know that the business of living men is to examine the works of the deceased and mend them.

'That policy, founded upon the certainty of the rich abundance of all things necessary to human existence within our own shores, and of the consequent duty and advantage of developing them, sought from foreign countries those commodities (happily for us, few and comparatively unimportant), which nature had denied to this; at the same time strictly protecting those branches of British industry which could not otherwise have been introduced amongst us, or preserved when established.'—p. 5.

If the author were asked, how he came by his certainty of the rich abundance of all things necessary to existence within our shores, he must either refer to the fact that individuals are starving through want; or he must assert, that the want arose from the absence of proper developement, and that the way to develope, was for each to take from his neighbour, with a general loss to the community besides. In short, what must be said is of this kind;—"Most beloved miniatures of men, you are lamentably pinched in the ribs; though there is a rich abundance of all things necessary to existence within your reach It is all for want of eating out of one another's pans. You have deserted the wisdom of your ancestors; you have forsaken the ancient and genuine policy, which was struck out by generations of incomparably greater intellect than yourselves. They brought to the subject the broadest lights of reason, and the utmost warmth of benevolence, and left nothing to be discovered in the fundamental principles of policy, to the witling monkeys of the day, but the secret of their own ignorance." In some such way as this, must the author account for the discrepancy, between men, or monkeys, being furnished with a rich abundance of all things necessary to existence, and still being starved.

'Now, it were most easy to show that, whatever reasons there might have been for the introduction of such a system (and they were such as will continue to operate in all countries where common sense prevails), such reasons were rendered infinitely more imperative by that course of events which has caused this country to be more heavily taxed than any other, and (thanks to the support of internal industry) long enabled it to dispense the most liberal reward to human labour of any nation upon earth. To allow British labour to be competed with by foreigners in our own market, then, is, in reference to our taxation, the most dishonest, and, in regard to our comforts, the

most cruel policy that ever was ventured upon by any government in the world, to say nothing of its folly.'—p. 5.

This brings the question at once to the much-vaunted pretext of taxation. Now let taxation be supposed as heavy as it may suit the opponent to imagine it;—let it, if it will gratify him, be doubled or trebled, or let every man keep the hundredth for himself and the remainder for the government:—*in what manner will that make it desirable or advantageous*, that gloves should be bought from an Englishman for three shillings, instead of from a Frenchman for two? Go over the whole statement of the case. Consider the two shillings that must be taken from the Sheffield cutler, the one shilling that must be taken from that other quarter in which it would have been expended if things had been left to take their own course, and the final and uncompensated loss of one pair of gloves in three to the consumer,—and then let anybody point out if he can, in what way the presence of taxation to any possible extent, makes it desirable that this assured loss should be voluntarily incurred. Does it cause any profit to arise from forcibly taking two shillings' worth of employment from the taxed cutler to bestow it on the taxed glove-maker? Or from taking the other shilling's worth from the various taxed personages on whom it would otherwise have been conferred? And last of all, does it in any shape make it advantageous or reasonable, that the taxed wearer of gloves should be deprived of one pair of gloves in three? To put the parallel case, is the existence of taxation any reason why the citizens of London should not ride in an Omnibus? And would it be so, even though an Omnibus could only be procured by the exchange of Sheffield goods, from France? When the supporters of the monkey policy answer these questions, they may take some rank among the maligned generation of political economists. If they cannot, they will be in a fair way of being condemned by public ridicule, to the appropriate punishment of joining with other old women, in leading their apes in Tartarus.

'In behalf of the former system I have mentioned names; I will now make a still more important appeal, I mean, to facts. Reasonings, by whomsoever urged, may fail; experience never. Under that system of policy, and in spite of obstacles the most formidable, the nation increased its wealth, promoted its prosperity, consolidated its power, and extended its dominion. Depressions, there certainly did occur in the country; but these, which, towards the last, were plainly traceable to the introduction of parts of the absurd policy now adopted, were, comparatively speaking, slight and temporary, and above all, partial. If one interest suffered, the rest were in a condition to sustain it; the vibrations of the national balance soon subsided into the equipoise of settled and general prosperity. The history of the world

exhibits not the nation whose advancement was so rapid, and whose prosperity seemed to promise such perpetuity.'—p. 6.

'Let us, therefore, now turn to the present condition of things amongst us. What now is the situation of the country? A retrogression in three or four short years, since the new theory has been in operation, of the most alarming nature, in whatever point of view it is considered. What is the great interest,—which the place,—in this heretofore happy empire, that is now prospering? Where is it that general distress is not now experienced, and impending ruin dreaded? What is the pursuit which is profitable to the employer, or which sustains in comfort the employed? Who shall say whether that mass of bodily suffering which the almost starving operatives now endure, or the mental and concealed anguish which many of their former employers experience, is the most heavy and heart-rending!'—p. 7.

This is what is said to those privileged to eat the Whitby dinner. Now hear the story of those outside. When the supporters of old abuses got the upper hand, their first operation was to double the national expenditure by borrowing, for twenty years together, as the expenditure of a spendthrift is doubled by mortgaging. When this came to an end, as come it must, —their next operation was to enact the prohibition of foreign commerce, with a view to raising the price of the produce of their own estates. They gave us the debt first, and the Corn Laws and Trade Restrictions to help to pay it. They have shut us up on a limited allowance of food; and then tell us to mend ourselves by pillaging each other. When we complain, they harangue upon the misery after the forms of the last new book of Rhetoric Made Easy, and gravely tell us, it is all because we do not snatch from each other with sufficient alertness, and by reason of certain innovations and departures which have already been effected from the venerable custom of our predecessors.

Nobody denies either the general distress, or the impending ruin. The only question is, whether they are caused by the shutting up and pillaging each other, or by the want of it. It is easy to say to the sufferers, "See here is a hard-hearted wretch,—a political economist, if you ever heard of such a creature,—who wants to starve you all to death. He wants to cut short every monkey's son of you, by all you used to take out of your neighbours' pans. Attack him, bite him, pull him by the tail." All this it is most easy to say; and it is not difficult to conceive what a storm of claws might be brought upon the hairy philosopher who had ventured the suggestion. But still the question reduces itself, to whether anything is to be gained by stealing from each other, or not. If there is, then the symposiasts of Whitby are great philosophers.

'And first, if we turn our eyes to the agriculturists,—who, &c.—I say, turning to the agricultural operatives, what is their condition?

The farmers of the kingdom are on the verge of ruin; many of them are already inextricably engulfed: poverty and distress pursue, and have already reached them. The labourers, in entire counties together, are in the deepest distress, and are almost universally pauperised; and their condition has had its full share in reducing the manufacturing operatives to a like, or even a worse situation.'—p. 7.

Is this too because the ship-owners of Whitby are not allowed to eat out of their neighbours' pans? It is not even pretended that it is; and the reason given is too curious to be omitted. It is no other than that "with tens of millions of acres "of land wholly uncultivated, *millions of which are amongst "the richest soils in the world*, with millions more, especially in "Ireland, not half laboured; and with an incredible and increas-"ing number of hands out of employment, and whom we must "sustain, though we wholly lose their labour," we are still of such a dense and unteachable capacity, that Jack will not go to Gill, and apply themselves to the multiplication of the public happiness which seems to be waiting only for their combination. And the means by which this strange piece of self-denial is brought about, is because "we habitually employ the labourers "of distant countries, while ours are idle; call their fields into "cultivation while we neglect our own; furnish with capital "foreign rivals in other branches of industry which they will "assuredly employ against us, while we voluntarily diminish "the national resources; and still our population is inade-"quately, and, relatively speaking, dearly fed."

Now all this falls to the ground—*exigui pulveris jactu*, as gentlemen say in the House of Commons—the moment it is comprehended, that nothing can be procured from abroad without being accompanied by the expenditure of the same amount in the end upon native workmen, as if the article had been created with any given amount of waste and expense at home. This being once known, the whole sinks into that class of vegetable, which Swift denominated "fudge." It dwindles into the sophistry of men sitting down to eat a good dinner, and anxious to eat more, out of their neighbours' pots. That "millions of acres of the richest soils in the world remain uncultivated," is a woeful attempt on the credulity of mankind. Has madness visited the agriculturists, that they refuse to take the harvests that are lying ready for their grasp? When were they known to omit taking anything they could, either of their own or of their neighbours? Not a cabin-boy at Whitby but may have formed some dim conception, that if land is uncultivated, it is because it will not pay. His betters at the dinner will be ready to inform him, that the way to make it pay, is to find somebody from whom to take the difference by force.

'But, it appears, we are not to pause even here; the economists

recommend perseverance in this policy [*not the policy of dining out of each other's pans, but the opposite*], and its still wider application. They deliberately advise the desertion or abandonment of agriculture, to the extent of putting three-sixths of our soil out of cultivation. Whither, then, must the dispossessed millions of wretched fugitives resort? To the manufacturing districts, certainly. They must become the rivals of the present operatives there, instead of remaining their steadiest customers, and that at a time when the goods already fabricated are so immense in quantity as to inundate the world, and so low in price as to starve the manufacturers. Political economists, I am well aware, have an answer for all this; it consists of a future promise; but the people of England have been long amused by promises from the same quarter, and have been cruelly deceived; and moreover, they have been reduced to such a condition by this miserable mismanagement, that they can no longer wait, &c.'—p. 8.

This leads to the demonstration—which is in fact nothing but a recapitulation of the former argument,—that the Corn Laws are themselves the grossest instance of the impolicy condemned in the parable of the monkeys. When all and each of us pay twice as much for our daily bread as we need to do, it is clear that if we were relieved from this feudal slavery, we should pay the difference to somebody else for *something*. The trading part of the community would therefore in the aggregate be just where they are; only we should have that something, which we are now gratuitously deprived of. Whatever was taken from the agriculturists who now rob us, would be given to the classes which would be employed by the expenditure of that of which we ceased to be robbed. What is meant by "inundating the world," is only that the goods now manufactured are more than we can sell while we are prohibited by act of parliament from receiving the only thing which we want and our customers have to pay in; and the story of our goods being "low in price," is referable to the same explanation. The "fugitives," and the "wretchedness," and the "rivals," are therefore in the main only a specimen of Swift's vegetable before alluded to. It may be quite true, that the change from robbing to not robbing, may have its inconveniences for the parties who suffer the translation. And therefore, upon their due representation of the facts, it is possible the public might give them time. But the inconvenience of such translation to the parties, can be no reason why the wrong should go on for ever. The great secret in English internal policy, is to get up a given quantity of wrong, and then set the wrong to cry out against the inconvenience of its own removal. It is true that great suffering might be the result to the "wretched fugitives" who for fifteen years have favoured us with Corn-laws, if they were all turned over to seek employment elsewhere at once. But, in

the first place, let their suffering be as great as it might, it is all only the consequence of their own previous injustice; for which the sufferers by that injustice are in no degree responsible. And in the next place, there is always the resource,—which nobody has yet contended against, though it is impossible to tell what may be the result of an obstinate resistance to amendment,—of making the alteration gradual. Because certain millions of agriculturists have been accustomed to live upon the rest of the community—and live miserably ill after all,—it does by no means follow that the evil must be perpetuated. That it will be perpetuated as long as the others will endure it, is undoubted; and the extent and limit of this endurance, is a question which time will solve.

'Turning, then, to the manufacturing interests, we find that, respecting these, the most disheartening and prejudicial system has been adopted. We have legalized the constant introduction, under certain duties, of articles of foreign industry, which have, in many branches of business, necessarily interfered with home labour, and greatly diminished its recompense; and we have done this without even attempting to obtain any countervailing advantages in behalf of our own operatives. Our silk-manufacturers, our shoemakers, our glovers, and very many others engaged in still more operose and profitable branches of employment, comprehending, in the whole, a great multitude of our industrious countrymen, have been subjected to the distressing rivalry of foreigners.' That this has lessened the demand for home labour there can be little doubt; none whatever that it has greatly diminished its wages; indeed, I myself have heard those who were mainly instrumental in introducing the change, exult in the vastly greater cheapness of the goods, when fabricated, which that change has occasioned. I heard the exultation at the time with sorrow; I heard it with shame; when I recollected that those who uttered it made no lessening demands upon the public purse, which has still to be replenished in their behalf by the harder efforts of a suffering people. But the exultation, after all, was natural; their interests are adverse; as are those of a body unhappily too numerous, who are the avowed and persevering enemies of a protected internal industry.'—p. 9.

It would be simple repetition, to go again over the proof, that the silk-manufacturers, the shoemakers, the glovers, and all the rest, get nothing by restrictions but what they take from some other tradesman, with the gratuitous loss of the difference of price to the consumers besides. It is therefore totally untrue, that they or any of them are subjected to the rivalry of foreigners at all. They are subjected to the rivalry of their own countrymen, who can make what other people want, when *they* cannot; and their prayer is, that their countrymen in some part or other may be put down for their use and benefit, and

the public lose the difference besides. The argument on taxation has also been shown to be unfounded; unless it can be shown where and how an increased capacity for paying taxes would arise out of the system of every man stealing from his neighbour. And if these positions are true, it follows, that the whole outcry about protecting internal industry, is the invention of men who want to feed out of their neighbours' vessels; —that in fact internal industry cannot be protected, except by removing the thing called protection;—and that all that is done by the restrictions under the monkey system, is to prevent internal industry from exerting itself in directions where it would otherwise take place, and to saddle the consumers with a large loss as the price of this consummation.

The allusion to "countervailing advantages," leads to the examination of the fallacy of "reciprocity." If it is the part of rational creatures to buy gloves where they are cheapest, the rationality of doing this is not affected by the question whether a foreigner will be wise enough to do some equally rational thing in return. Supposing that France, for instance, should proclaim her immoveable attachment to the immemorial system of the monkey race; nobody has shown the slightest reason why a *homo sapiens* in England should adhere to the same policy with respect to anything he has the power to obtain from France. The assertion that there is any reciprocity to be waited for in the affair, is a weak invention of the enemy, who wants to be busy with our pans. It is an attempt to retard the result of having three pairs of gloves instead of two, by attaching it to the contingency of a Frenchman's having the wit to do a similar good office to himself. The benefit of ceasing to refuse a commerce that is gainful to ourselves with France, is not in any degree dependent on whether France has the sense to enter on some other commerce that is gainful to herself with us. If she does, there may be two benefits to us instead of one; but the existence of the one is not dependent on the existence of the other. Put the case that England insists on making gloves, and France cotton goods; and each at a loss. The common sense of ceasing to make gloves at a loss, is not at all affected by whether France has the sense to do the same with cotton goods.

'One thing has often struck me as to the policy of our projectors, namely, the address with which they manage to set the various interests of the country against each other; managing the successive depressions of each by appealing to the selfish feelings of the rest. Thus, I think, I well remember a certain individual holding forth to the Liverpool ship-owners, that they might probably be compensated for the loss of their protection by a similar withdrawal of that of the

agriculturists; the granary of the empire might, partially at least, be placed, it was hoped, abroad; and then the ship-owners would, of course, share in transporting hither the constant supplies, (little chance for this, however, I ween, under the reciprocity system!)—but both ship-owners and agriculturists were to get other commodities cheaper by the free-trade system; silks, for instance; and the silk-manufacturer, in his turn, was to be propitiated by the sacrifice of the throwster,' &c.—p. 10.

This is manifestly the argument that would be applied against the monkey reformer. "Do not you see how cunningly he goes about to persuade *you* of the red hips, to give up your share out of your neighbour's pan; by pretending to persuade *him* of the blue nose to do the same?" And there is no doubt that many of the pigmy race might think this marvellous good reason, and show their white teeth at political economists. But still there is no sensible man in cool possession of the facts, who does not see that it is one monkey trick to support another; and that nobody can possibly be the better for it, except the lucky rogue who may chance to fill his pouches in the scramble at the expense of all the rest.

'The object of these changes was, all the while, low prices (otherwise we pay little compliment to the sagacity of their promoters); and, after all, a more insane attempt than to effectuate that, could never have entered into the head of man, when it is considered that we have a fixed incumbrance or debt, to a vast amount, on which the cheapening of the value of property and of labour in the country which has to sustain it, operates as an enormous augmentation. The fundholders, the jobbers, the brokers of the community, may and do feel the advantages of these changes; some of these dictate the carrying them still further into effect; but it will be well for them, even with a view to their own permanent interests, to pause, or they will find the mischief they meditate "for others, will fall upon their own pate." Eight hundred millions of debt, and cheap prices, are not convertible terms, no more than are foreign competition and British comfort. Seen in the light of true political philosophy, all the different branches of industry in a community are united in the bonds of mutual interest as well as amity; and, if one be weaker than the rest, the others are willing to extend to it a helping hand; but the new system sees things in a different light; "Buy where you can buy cheapest" is the motto, though it is one which would wholly divest us of all our local duties and attachments, and even of patriotism itself.'—p. 10.

The unreasonableness of pretending to remedy eight hundred millions of debt by robbing one tradesman of employment to serve another, with a gratuitous loss to the consumer besides, has been exposed already. The "true political philosophy" of the Whitby speech, means evidently the philosophy of Exeter

Change. "Buy where you can buy cheapest," will carry the day after all; unless it can be shown what local duty or attachment directs the putting down a capable tradesman to raise up an incapable one, and what patriotism there is in consulting together to effect a general loss. The great fallacy is in the assertion—without a shadow of proof, and in the mere expectation that shallow people will find some jingle of verisimilitude in the mode of putting it—that the evil of having expended eight hundred millions for dishonest purposes, is to be remedied by making laws to enable one British tradesman to take the bread out of another's mouth.

'These, gentlemen, are my general views on the subject; general, I may call them, for they embrace the interests and pursuits of every industrious class amongst us, including even the very humblest of them; and I rejoice to say, they are becoming universal among the operatives. The noble English maxim, "Live and let live," is reviving. Whether it regards the labourer at the plough, or the manufacturer at his loom, I have always felt, what I have somewhere expressed,—

"Let those that till, and those that weave,
Still by their honest labours live."

And I shall never exchange this feeling for the dry and unfeeling dogmas of political economy.'—p. 11.

It remains to be seen whether the operatives will be persuaded, that "Live and let live," means "Rob and let rob, and pay double for your bread;" or will prefer the dry and unfeeling dogmas of political economy, which tell them that every man should keep his own. The continual scorn which it pleases the defenders of ancient follies to pour out upon political economy, will be of prodigious use the moment the balance turns in favour of the people, and they see who have been their friends, and why the exercise of reason has been reviled.

The descriptions of "the father of the cottage, who sits, idle, and distressed, brooding over the fate of those from whom his eyes are averted,"—and of "the poor homeless female, shivering in the portico below the dazzling drawing-room,"—come with an ill grace from those who are engaged over their own dinners in endeavouring to secure the prohibition of the exchange of the produce of industry for food, and whose only recipe for the removal of the ills they state, consists in bidding the sufferers plunder from each other.

The eaters of the Whitby dinner are next informed, that "thousands of the people in Lancashire are subsisting on fifteen-pence a head per week, and even that pittance is earned by extreme and long-protracted labour;" and that "thousands

in the neighbourhood of Huddersfield" are in the same condition. *And how should it be otherwise*, when the speaker and his friends have passed a law against foreign commerce, and forbidden the starving manufacturer to exchange his produce for food? A dinner was an ill-chosen time to be mellifluous on such a subject.

Suppose now, that a hundred rats, instead of being mercifully killed in five minutes by the celebrated dog Billy, were caged up and supplied with a limited quantity of food, and encouraged to multiply till they starved each other by the subdivision of the allowance;—and say whether this picture, ugly and disgusting as it is, is not a representation of the condition in which the country has been placed by the influence of the monopolists. Imagine next a well-dressed man, with all the ensigns of respectability and good-fellowship about him, declaiming on the misery of the sufferers with the remains of a tartlet in his mouth, and pointing out to the spectators the different forms and aspects of the process. "See that individual of the "softer sex, with thirteen helpless young ones dependent on "it for support. Their whole allowance is but fifteen grains "a day; and there are people who would ruin the whole rat-"trap by letting in foreign corn. Observe the 'father of the "cottage,' with his ribs clinging together and no fur upon his "back, brooding over the fate of his suffering family, over "whom his heart is yearning and breaking. That poor crea-"ture with his ear bitten off, is from Congleton. The insur-"rectionary cock-tail in the middle is from Macclesfield. "The Coventry rats are in a corner by themselves. From "Rochdale, Manchester, and Barnsley they are all alike; "there is not a pin to choose. Would to God my voice could "reach them and be listened to [here quote sundry texts of "Scripture and swallow the remains of the tartlet]. Why do "not they 'agitate for bread?' Why do not they turn tooth "and nail upon the wretches who would murder them by "letting in foreign produce?" The application may not be complimentary; but till it is shown in what way a starving people are to be fed by shutting out supplies and taking from each other, it is an exact representation of the politics of the Whitby speech.

One great truth however is undoubtedly evolved in it; and that is, that "it is not Providence that is chargeable with the miseries of the people." They have everything that could tend to the extension of industry with scarcely a visible limit; if the laws could be got rid of by which industry is prohibited. They are surrounded by the ocean, which would truly be "an inexhaustible mine of wealth," if the owners of the land did

not shut up the passage. There is no need for defying any man; there is not one that has the least desire to attribute the ill to Providence. It would be as just to attribute to it the sufferings of the rats. The proverb says, "God sends meat, and the devil sends cooks." And most devilishly they have cooked us, for our folly and stupidity in allowing them their way.

'Nor, secondly, is it the character or conduct of the inhabitants to which the present distress of the country is attributable.'—p. 17.

Granted;—with the exception of their proneness to be persuaded to combine for the general loss, in the hope of individual gain.

'Nor is it the number of our countrymen which has produced it. Fashionable as is this diabolical doctrine, for diabolical it is, inasmuch as it begins by affronting God, and issues in injuring man; it is, like many other fashionable notions, utterly false. It is the prerogative of God, saving the presence of our political economists, to decide this question; and he has decided it, in the superabundance of the means of human subsistence, which, as a nation, he has lavished upon us, placed within our reach, and solicited us to accept. Whether in reference to the resources of the country, or its means of profitable employment, if properly developed, there is not a sinew or an arm too many in the empire, no nor elsewhere, any more than there is a superfluous spirit called into the realms of immortality by the Eternal God! Short indeed, and infernal, would be the remedy, were this revolting notion true. Deportation of every kind, murder in all its forms, indirect or otherwise, would be obvious and general benefits. Still, however, the promulgators of this notion, with the habitual selfishness of the system, pronouncing upon the redundancy of human being, invariably except themselves. The Christian advocates of this doctrine are not its personal converts;—whether as it respects life, or its propensities and feelings, they make no personal sacrifices. They are no Curtiuses,—but I see your indignation at the very mention of these notions; and, rather than on the dogmas of the political economists, we will still rest, as to this matter, upon the assurances of Him who "giveth food to all flesh; for his mercy endureth for ever."'—p. 18.

Compare the case with that of the rats, and see how all this "sublime and beautiful" falls to the ground. The number of the sufferers is one element of the suffering; but it is entirely subordinate to the great cause of all, *videlicet* their being shut up. The people of England are prohibited from selling the produce of their labour; and are confined by act of parliament to a given quantity of food. If the terms of the act allow to "veer and haul" a little, by admitting corn on certain terms during the existence of particular degrees of pressure,—it might as well be argued that a bird tied by the leg to a spiral

spring is not confined, because on further efforts it can always gain another fraction of an inch. In this state of things the remedy is neither diabolical, nor infernal, nor revolting ; for it is simply to take away the prohibition. It is quite true that under the pressure of the suffering, some men have been driven to indefensible propositions for keeping down the population, as one possible means of diminishing the immediate torture. There would be no wonder if the rats in similar circumstances proposed the same. But if they do, it is only a horror the more, to be laid to the charge of the devout persons who stand by to watch the process. It would be as pious, meritorious, and wise, to call upon "Him who giveth food to all flesh," in reference to the miserable animals whom man has determined to shut up and starve. It is a flagrant mistranslation to say that God has given food *to* all flesh ; he has given it *for* all flesh, and *to* so many of them as can prevent man from stopping it by the way.

In his discussions on the circulating medium, it is curious to see how far the writer goes with reasonable and demonstrable notions on the subject, and still contrives to end in fallacy. Very few men of the political habits of the orator, ever arrive at knowing half so much of the principles of what he terms *monetary* value, as he does ; he is a *rara avis* among his kind. But by what accident does it suit him to forget, that if one government raised the value of money by returning to a gold currency, it was because another had committed a grand act of larceny by the issues of paper ?—that if the fundholders had been robbed of forty millions by a heaven-born minister, the plain men who succeeded him did nothing but put an end to the progress of the robbery, by returning to an honest currency ? It is clear, that as far as relates to the old fundholders, they offered nothing in the shape of compensation for past robbery ; their simple merit, when they make up their political accounts for heaven, must be limited to refusing to take more. And, as relates to the gains of new fundholders, it has been proved and is ready to be demonstrated at any time, that if the gains and losses of all the fundholders are lumped together, an "equitable adjustment," whenever the time may come for it, will be in favour of the fundholders and not against them. There is no justice in calling out against the half of the act that was repentance, and concealing the half that was sin. As far as regards the effect on the holders of the circulating medium, it is plain that the value of some eight or nine millions was taken from the holders of the currency (which means everybody), by the fraudulent issues of paper, and that a similar amount was given back to them by the return to

honesty. This was not restitution with precision of persons; because many of the first sufferers were only to be come at by their successors. But it was a restitution as exact as the case admitted; and one infinitely better than no restitution at all. If the value of the taxes has been increased by the return of the currency to its just value (as may have happened on the supposition that ministers had the ingenuity to tax different articles *ad valorem* while the currency was being debased, and by a fixed nominal amount when it was returning to its proper value)—the part of sensible men is to call for a reduction of the taxes, but not to call for a debased currency as the means of reducing the taxes. Such a proceeding would only be matched by the conduct of the man, who set his house on fire to warm himself. There might be a certain degree of mischief arising on the return to an honest currency, from the perturbation of contracts; but the main and principal effect of this very perturbation of contracts, was to give an advantage to the same classes of people who had been the losers by the other. The nature of dishonesty is to produce suffering, both during its existence and at its removal; but it by no means follows that therefore it must exist for ever. If a surgeon can cure a broken leg without giving pain, he will undoubtedly deserve to be highly rewarded. But if he cannot, it does not follow that the leg must be let alone.

The remainder of the speech is principally aimed at endeavouring to obtain the suffrages of individuals, to the promotion of the general system of shutting us up like the rats, for the benefit of monopolists. No means are omitted, by which the ignorant and unthinking may be induced to believe their personal advantage implicated in the perpetuation of this discreditable policy. The engine of deception, as in the instances already specified, consists in the same kind of imperfect tracing of the connexion between causes and effects, which has led so many men astray in the pursuit of a perpetual motion;—in the hasty assumption that some desirable consequence is established and attained, without waiting to determine whether it may not be necessarily balanced by a contrary tendency arising out of its own existence, at some other point.

If these observations on the Coryphæus of the system of Exeter Change are unceremonious, it must be borne in mind that the author of the speech thought proper to set out with an unmeasured attack upon all and everybody who in considering the same subject had come to a different conclusion from his own. If they are witlings, let him prove in sober sadness, that the monkey theory is right. If political economists are the bane of the country, let him at least back it by demon-

strating that they are in the wrong. It is always wise, in selling the bear's skin beforehand, to make a decent reserve for the possibility of failure. The *Ursa Major* of a discontented and suffering public, is what is technically termed an ugly customer; and whoever goes forth to break a lance upon its hide, has no occasion to provide for adding the ridicule of ostentation to the misfortune of defeat.

Anterior to the Whitby speech in point of date, and only inferior to it in celebrity through the absence of the éclat which attends the personal exertions of the orator, is the paper cited in the title, on THE CONDITION OF THE EMPIRE. The condition of the empire is everybody's concern; it is to all and each of us, what the condition of the rat-trap would be if we were the rats. Hear therefore how the "genuine political economists" of the North proceed to deal with our distresses.

'The British empire at this moment possesses incalculable advantages beyond what was ever possessed by any other great nation; it possesses everything requisite for commanding almost uninterrupted prosperity and happiness. Yet this empire is overwhelmed with suffering, and is admitted to be in danger of ruin.'—*Blackwood's Ed. Mag.* No. CLIV. p. 97.

This is the part which nobody doubts. Everybody begins with being right; and the way to go wrong, is to slip into it gently.

'Your Ministry and Legislature declare that they cannot account for this, they will attempt nothing in the way of remedy, and all they do enlarges the suffering and makes the ruin more certain. To make you sensible of the real causes, we cannot do better than give you the following infallible receipt for utterly ruining any great empire.'

'Do not act on vague generalities, and attempt to strike the whole mass at once; but adapt your measures to circumstances, and destroy in detail. The prosperity of the nation can only exist in that of the individual; and the prosperity of the individual can only exist in good profits on the employment of his capital, or good wages. Compel the individual to employ his capital without profit, or at a loss, or to labour for inadequate wages, and you will keep them in constant distress; you will drag every capitalist, in succession, through bankruptcy, and chain every workman to penury and want. By thus ruining the individual, you must inevitably triumph in your efforts to ruin the empire.'—p. 98.

This looks specious. It is true as far as it goes. But pray heaven there be not coming the monkey theory after all.

'Having made these self-evident truths your own, apply them in the first place to your agriculture. If you can only keep the prices of agricultural produce below remunerating ones, this will manifestly strip your landlords and farmers of profits and capital, and your husbandry labourers of the necessary means of subsistence. You

cannot accomplish it by prohibiting your farmers from asking other than prices fixed by law, but you may do so in another manner. Open your market to the cheap produce of foreign countries; admit the corn, provisions, wool, seeds, tallow, &c. &c. of such countries, at prices which will not remunerate your own agriculturists; and this will be as effective as a law for fixing prices. Your land-owners, farmers, and husbandry labourers—probably half your population—will thus be strictly bound to constant loss and suffering.'

'Then apply the truths to your shipping interest. Place such foreign ships on an equality with your own, in your market, as can afford to take much lower freights; and it will inevitably bind this interest to constant loss and suffering.'

'In the same manner, apply the truths to all your manufactures and trades as far as possible. Admit into your market foreign silks, gloves, lace, shoes, &c. &c., at such prices as your own manufacturers cannot afford to take; and this must inevitably bind all the souls engaged in the fabrication of such articles, to constant loss and suffering.'

'If you, unhappily, have manufactures and trades which cannot be undersold by foreign opponents, it will be more difficult to restrict them, by direct means, to continual losing prices. But your measures against your agriculture, &c., by confining considerably more than half your population to unceasing distress, must indirectly go far towards placing the remainder in the same condition. Providence has most wisely made it a law of nature, that the minority shall suffer with the majority. The distress of the majority must bind the minority to reduced trade, insufficient employment, stagnation, bad debts, and inadequate prices.'—p. 98.

It is the same. Christopher North is turned wild-beast show-man; and after haranguing with due emphasis in favour of each brute of fang and claw, winds up with—"There you see the little Tory Monkeys, male *and* female. Observe the way those animals take their food; each eats out of its neighbour's pan. By this means, they double the common stock; a wonderful provision of nature in those climates!" The *puir body* had ever a *deevil* of a stomach himself, for eating what other people are to pay for. It is enough to make a man sick, to see how these church-and-king men fill what they call their "waims," when somebody else is to find the means. Talk of a "pock-pudding"—a couple of honest yeomen might dine, out of what it takes one of these to "refresh drooping nature," after a relaxation of seven minutes and a half. Contrast the gluttony of these particular gormandizers, with the fare of the miserable monkeys they tell to fatten themselves by stealing from one another. Ask how many working men have been starved by corn laws, to get up the hotch-potch of Mr. Tickler, and how many women and children for the turtle of the Shepherd; how

many industrious people drink water, that Mr. Theodore may have Vin de Grave, and Mullion champagne;—and say whether the people of Great Britain are not a good-natured race, to endure the laying in the wound thus of the knife that made it, in types which have nothing of the obscure, and parables which are anything but dark sayings.

'Undertaking the humble toil which they *(the Economists and Philosophers)* disdain, we will look at the divisions of your population severally, and trace the distress of each to its cause, by means of the ignoble evidence of common-place demonstration. In the first place, why are your farmers distressed? Because they cannot obtain for their produce what will cover their outgoings. The last harvest was not a deficient one to any material extent except in wheat; and if wheat had been a full crop, they would still have been distressed, as was proved in the last year, by its cheapness. If your farmers could procure a certain addition to the prices of their various kinds of produce, they would enjoy prosperity. This is a fact which you cannot controvert.'—p. 99.

They would enjoy prosperity, till they discovered that they wanted more. If the community was fool enough to tax itself to pay them for growing corn on the sea-beach, they would only want to be paid for growing it on a stone floor. What they mean by "covering their outgoings," is covering them on the worst land on which they may please to go, and giving them a profit for their pains. Suppose a manufacturer were to demand to be paid for making broad cloth out of the most worthless wool he chose to find convenient. It would only be a copy of the injustice which the agriculturists, by dint of the worst system of representation in Europe, have succeeded in thrusting down our throats. Everything that is paid to them for what they call "their outgoings," must be taken from the industrious in some other trade or calling, with a gratuitous loss of equal amount to the consumer besides. The same for the shipowners, and the *hoc genus omne* of the trades, the crafts, the mysteries, who have discovered the necessity of living on the public. There is some policy in the rural ordinance, which says a pauper shall wear a badge. Pay for the paupers in badges, while it is necessary; but not for the paupers in badges and in coaches too. Decline finding paupers in venison. Object utterly to discharging their bills at the London Tavern. Let five shillings a week be the boundary of your humanity; and let that be taken with a mark and a suit of parish blue.

The truth in plain terms is, that the moment a trader finds his occupation is not wanted, and that he can only live by robbing some other trader the demand for whose commodities is on the increase, he should draw in his horns and retire, as the

wig-makers were obliged to do; and not go to parliament to ask to have men obliged to shave their heads, in order that his obsolete compounds may find a market. If this piece of common justice had been enforced from the beginning, the necessary transfers would have taken place from time to time by insensible gradations. As was the case with the wigs, fewer men would from year to year have been bred to the trade that nobody wanted, and more to some business which the country was disposed to pay for. As has been said before, the great art in all cases of fraud upon the public, is to get up a *quantum sufficit* of the wrong, and then set the abomination to defend itself. The abomination of wigs would have been supported in the same way, if there had been an aristocracy of wig-makers. On this point there is no difference between the morality of the compounder of caxons, and of the landed peer who stands up for the interests of his order. They would all shear us alike; except so far as there is a virtue in the community, to keep our polls from their discretion.

'It matters not what your currency, your harvests, or the prosperity of your manufacturing classes may be, your farmers cannot, under your laws for the admission of foreign produce, obtain adequate prices. They are distressed by bad prices, and your laws prohibit them from gaining higher ones. You must admit that this is established fact, and not speculation.'—p. 100.

They are distressed because they chuse to grow what nobody wants from them, and demand to be paid for it. They are distressed because the laws allow them to take twenty shillings from the people, but do not allow them to take thirty. Like all others who live upon the public, their wants will keep pace with any laws that may be made for their encouragement. Tell the inhabitants of St. Giles's that a tax on bread shall be laid for their support, and the only consequence will be that they will soon demonstrate that they want three times more. The horse-leech and her two daughters, are no types of a cast that once obtains a legal right to live on the community. A country that should be inundated for the sake of breeding horse-leeches,—with a promise to supply as much blood as the accumulation of their numbers should demand,—would be the fitting representative of such a situation as we live in.

'In the next place, why are your shipowners distressed? Are overtrading, the currency, machinery, &c. the causes here? If the question be ridiculous, you compel us to put it. Your shipowners are distressed because they cannot obtain remunerating freights, and they cannot obtain such freights because you have placed them by law in these circumstances—in a considerable part of their trade, they must either accept losing freights, or incur the greater loss of abandoning

it to foreigners, and suffering their ships to fot in port; the rate of freight fixed by law in this part of their trade must of necessity be the rate in their trade generally.'—p. 100.

The ship-owners are distressed (if they *are* distressed;—some people think when they have occasion to make new docks, they are *not* distressed),—because they insist upon building ships that nobody wants to employ. Ship or wig, the theory and practice are the same. The community says, We do not want your wigs. "But you *shall* have them," says the peruke-maker, "or else what is to become of *me*?" The community does not want their ships!—Is it intelligible? There are other British tradesmen, on whom the same amount is expended that would be expended on the ship-owners; and with this material advantage besides, that a difference equal to the difference of freight is saved to the consumers. The ship-owners want to have an act of parliament to take the employment and profits from these tradesmen and give them to themselves, and saddle the consumers with a loss equal to the difference of freight besides. What they complain of is, that "you have placed them by law in these circumstances" that they cannot take what they would. Many other classes have precisely the same complaint against the law; as the new police can testify.

'And now why are your silk, glove, and lace manufacturers distressed? They cannot obtain prices which will yield profits to the master and necessaries to the workman. Why are their prices so bad? Because they cannot raise them to remunerating ones, without having their trade taken from them by foreigners. If the prices of the silk manufacturers were raised sixpence per yard, and those of the glove manufacturers were raised in the same proportion, you are well aware that foreigners would destroy the trade of both. As to the lace manufacturers, foreign blond lace has destroyed their trade already. Here is one cause of the distress; another is to be found in the fact which you cannot question, that the large import of foreign silks, gloves, and lace, destroys a vast mass of employment, and keeps the market constantly glutted. Your laws demonstrably prohibit these three manufactures from obtaining adequate prices, and take from them much of their trade.'—p. 100.

The demand for "remunerating prices," always means making people pay for something they do not want. It means robbing one tradesman who can make what people will voluntarily buy, to give the same amount of employment and profits to another that cannot; with a loss to the consumer equal to the difference of price besides. "That the large import of foreign silks, gloves, and lace, destroys a vast mass of employment"—instead of being a "fact which you cannot question," is an assertion of which the truth has been disproved. It destroys *no*

employment in the long run. It only shifts the employment, from those who cannot make what anybody wants to buy, to those who can;—with a saving to the consumers, of the difference of price besides. What the laws demonstrably do, is to hinder all these classes from being robbed for the sake of giving half the produce to the others. What the laws demonstrably do, is to say, "No man shall have the power of causing others to lose a shilling, on pretence that sixpence of it will find its way into his own pocket."

'Several other interests are placed by your laws in similar circumstances. Looking at all who are dependent solely or principally on agriculture in the United Kingdom, including the landowners and their dependents, as well as the farmers and their servants, they must comprehend one-half the population. The Shipping Interest, Silk Trade, and other Interests, circumstanced as we have stated, cannot have less than two millions of souls dependent on them. Here, then, is the majority of your population;—here are twelve or fourteen millions of people, strictly bound by your laws to constant loss and suffering. These millions have had one-fourth, one-third, and, in very many cases, the whole of their property destroyed by your laws; and they are prohibited by them from obtaining higher—taking into account the losses which bad seasons, &c. must for ever entail on the farmer and trader—than distress-prices. To ascribe their distress to over-trading, the corn law, and the thousand-and-one other causes which you plead, is an absurdity too gross for other ears than those of lunacy. It is not theory or speculative opinion, but it is a matter of arithmetical demonstration and a fact established by conclusive experiments, that your laws render it impossible for these millions to obtain prices and hold employment which will protect them from constant loss and suffering.'—p. 100.

This is adding up the amount of what every monkey used to take out of his neighbour's pan, and charging it as a common loss. The proposition urged is, that if there was a return to the venerable system, it would be a good to the community in general, and the majority of the population in particular would get rich. To which there are two answers;—first, that the community at large could not be benefited, but the contrary; secondly, that if half the population of monkeys *did* get rich, it must be taken out of the pans of the others,—which those others would be blameable to allow, if they can hinder it. The "Interests," always mean the interests which particular individuals or knots among the monkeys, have in what they can plunder from the others.

The argument about small notes has been alluded to already. It is imperiously necessary to skip and go on. The show-man becomes tiresome, and has nothing to produce but the same creatures over and over again.

'But you say the cheapness is so precious to your consumers. Mr. Huskisson speaks of a "British public" which benefits enormously from being thus dosed with cheap pennyworths. Where is this "British public?" Is it to be found amidst your landowners, farmers, and husbandry labourers? No. Does it exist amidst your shipowners, silk manufacturers, and makers of gloves and lace? Certainly not. Can it be discovered amidst your cotton, woollen, and iron manufacturers, or your producers of Colonial produce? Still, no. But there is your monied interest. The cheapness destroys the employment of capital, and reduces interest; the capitalist cannot invest his capital; the fundholder can only obtain an inadequate rate of interest, and he cannot employ his money more profitably. The mass of the British population demonstrably suffers severe distress from the cheapness, and no "British public" can be seen which benefits from it. Blind as you are, you see that it is a scourge to your consumers—and, of course, we need not say what it is to your producers.'—p. 107.

This again, is adding up what each monkey ceases to take out of his neighbours' pans, and denying that there is any monkey public that gains to the same amount. What they took, was their own gain; whether anybody lost it or not, is what nobody can tell. And this leads to the real explanation, which is, that the very individuals who stickle for the right of taking from their neighbours, pay their quota in the end. It may not be positively certain, that they each without exception individually lose as much as they gain; but it is plain that this must be the case with by far the greatest part. It is a fallacy, that demands of Mr. Huskisson to prove, that each particular "interest" to whose depredations he puts an end, is bettered by the process. If it is so, it is so much the better; and there is no doubt that it will happen in many cases. But still the proposition started with is not, that each of the pilferers will necessarily be the better, but that somebody else will be the better. The proposition is, that there is no general policy in pilfering. There may have been some of prodigious pouches, who contrived to be the gainers after all. But the proposition is, that for that very reason, they ought to be taken by the throat till they disgorge.

But as before, it is necessary to skip and go on. There cannot be fifty people in the country, incapable of carrying the monkey parallel through all that may be omitted.

'The grand principle of genuine political economy is—*National wealth and prosperity flow from the good profits and wages of the individual; therefore give these to the greatest number.* That of the savage counterfeit you follow is in reality—*National wealth and prosperity flow from the bad profits or wages of the individual; therefore give loss and hunger to the greatest number.* Could anything be conceived more

preposterous, than to attempt to produce general wealth and prosperity by making every business a losing and starving one? and yet this is precisely what you are doing.'—p. 115.

The obligation of the country to the defenders of abuse is infinite, for coming down from the high stilts of imagination and eloquence, and condescending to fight upon vulgar questions of arithmetic and common life. It is infinitely easier to meet them there, than when they contended for "social order" and the like incomprehensibles. In the present case, for example, is it possible that anybody can fail to see, that what they propose by their recipe, is to increase the profits and wages of one individual, by diminishing the profits and wages of some other? If the profits and wages in the trades which nobody wants, are to be increased by giving them a forced employment, it is clear that the profits and wages in some other trades will be diminished in a corresponding degree by the employment that is taken from them, and that there will be a loss to the consuming public equal to the difference besides. That national wealth and prosperity flow from the good profits and wages of the individual, is in itself a great truth. But then these good profits and wages must arise from a positive increase of trade in the aggregate, which can only be the result of freedom; and not from robbing one man to serve another. The rate of profits and wages depends on the velocity with which trade on the whole is increasing or the contrary. In mathematical terms, it varies as the fluxion of the trade; and this again depends upon the progress that is making in pushing forward the whole scale of production, by obtaining an increased command over the first necessaries of life, and is not to be effected by shutting ourselves up in a rat-trap and rubbing our halfpence against each other. It is this which demonstrates the limited utility of the various palliatives, with which men amuse themselves instead of applying their efforts to the removal of the great evil which is the shutting up. Such, for example, are the proposed remedies of "economy," of "clubs for reducing the price of the necessaries of life," and of "co-operative societies." If the rats were to be advised to economize or to "co-operate," it is evident that so long as there was a law restricting the quantity of corn they should be allowed to consume, all that they could do by it would be to make their respective shares go a little further than before, and to cause the division to approach a little nearer to equality. But none of these inventions could cause a hundred rats to get fat upon the allowance of twenty-five. In so far as on their first application they produced a temporary alleviation of the misery of the classes whose shares had been smallest, they would tend to the production of a cer

tain degree of increase in the population of rats in these classes. But as soon as this effect was accomplished, all things would go on as before; except that the palliative which had been applied already, could not be applied afresh. The secret of good living, with rats or men, consists in keeping open the connexion with the power of procuring a continually increasing quantity of food; and whichever of them allow themselves to be cut off from it to please their betters, condemn themselves to starve for their amusement.

Lastly, in order to support the monkey system,

'Promote religion [*of the kind which will make men servile*]—protect public morals [*among those who are to give and not to take*]—repress vice and infidelity [*by setting each man to rob his neighbour, and religion to hold the door*]—keep the different classes of the community in strict subordination to each other [*that slaves, white and black, may continue as they are*]—and cherish the principles, feelings, and habits, which give stability, beauty, and happiness to society [*constituted on the basis that every man shall feed out of his neighbour's pan who can.*]' —p. 118.

It is not easy to imagine what possible connexion religion can have with the question whether monkeys are best fed out of each other's pans, except as a blind. Somebody is to be persuaded, that it is pious to be plundered. Somebody is to be robbed by the intervention; and somebody else is to get fat. This is the *end-all* and *be-all* of the anti-liberals' piety. They call upon God, that they may take from man. They take away our means of living on this earth; and offer us their bill on heaven, payable to bearer, in return.

Nobody believes that the system of plundering one tradesman to please another, can hold-out much longer. It is right, however, to take all possible means to accelerate its fall. Wherever it has been tried,—in England, in America, in France,—there appears to be a general consent to come to an avowal of its folly. The means to hasten this, are, first, to endeavour to bring forward the manufacturers who are injured by the prohibition of the foreign trade. Thus in France, for example, the wine-growers are finding out, that they are the people who are depressed by the foolish attempt to produce iron and cotton goods, instead of buying them from foreigners with wine. In the next place, to impress on men in general, the high degree in which they are interested in the question in their character of consumers; and the certainty that if there is the least apparent doubt whether they are among the final gainers by the monkey system or not, the truth is that they are enormous losers. Finally, that the people should speak out, and not

allow themselves to be beaten down by the sound and fury of their opponents. The system is only the monkey system after all, whatever may be the Babel of noises got up among its supporters. The government is willing; but wants the aid of the public voice. It rests mainly with the public, whether they will continue to be fed out of one another's pans, or not.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 January, 1830.

ART. XII.—*The Address of the London Radical Reform Association to the People of the United Kingdom. Oct.* 19, 1829.—London. W. E. Andrews.

THERE are three kinds of men that profess to shoot a woodcock. The first are those who see their game, and fire at it as directly as they can. The second are they who fire without seeing their game at all. These are supposed to be considerably less successful than the others. The third kind are those who see the game, and make a point of firing the other way. And as these last were never known to kill a woodcock yet, the direct inference with many people is, that they never meant to do it from the first; and that if they bring home a list of killed of their neighbours' hogs, dogs, or poultry, it is because they really went out to bag this kind of prey, and not the other. In short there is a considerable and increasing sect who conceive, that one way of judging of the object of any man or set of men, is to observe the way they go about to compass it. It would be wrong to conceal, that this philosophy is not without opponents; there are many individuals of good estate who lean the other way. The sect therefore cannot claim authority on the ground of unanimous assent; or demand to have it set down like an axiom in Euclid, that the way to shoot woodcocks is to aim at them. It makes part of the debateable ground of natural science; and, in England at least, must be noted as one of those points, on which a prudent man should confine himself to observing that "a great deal may be said on both sides."

Precisely the same kind of obscurity hangs over certain parts of the subject of politics. For example, it is pretty generally professed to be acknowledged, that the people ought to be represented; but nobody has ever been able to determine, whether this is best done by their having voices in the election of their representatives, or by their having none. Some persons, for instance, think that it would promote the intended object, if large towns like Manchester and Leeds had a chance

for chusing at least one representative. Others, on the contrary, believe that the way to accomplish the end, is to cause two representatives to be elected by nine drunken men in Cornwall.

In this unsettled state of public opinion, the subject is clearly open to debate; and no man can be offended at any course his neighbour's judgment may pursue, seeing that his own must be equally hostile to the conclusions of somebody else. It is demonstrably unjust, that the man who determines on shooting with the butt-end, should put himself into a passion with his friends who prefer another way. It goes beyond the limits of social liberty; and is not to be tolerated even in the squire of the parish. Nobody wants *him* to shoot his birds but as he pleases; they only want to shoot their own.

If the people are to be represented at all, they ought to chuse their representatives. If they do not chuse their representatives, they are not represented at all. If some do and some do not, then some are represented and some not represented at all. And the grand query is, why some are to be not represented at all.

If a number of men were invited to form a joint-stock company for some common purpose, it would be an odd species of invitation which should begin by stating, that nine-tenths of the subscribers were to have no voice either in directing or inquiring into the application of the common stock. It would be tantamount to the advertisement, "Wanted, a number of gulls, who having no other way of losing their money, may be accommodated here." It would bear fraud and fallacy upon the face of it; and scarcely any man would be found hardy enough to put forward such a scheme, and assuredly none foolish enough to enter into it. Now if nobody would voluntarily enter into such a scheme, those who habitually live under the operation of such a one must do it involuntarily. It must be because they cannot help themselves; or in other words, because force is put upon them by those who have the luck to play the winning game.

If it was urged that in such an association it was necessary that those who held the larger stakes should have the larger share of direction, and that the way to compass this, *was that those who held the smaller stakes should have no share at all;* it is clear that such a proposition would be hooted off with general contempt. There may be reasons why there should be a difference; and if there is no naturally-existing cause why the holders of the larger stakes carry with them a proportionate influence over the holders of the smaller, it may be

right to produce the effect by artificial means. But whatever might be the necessity for such means, they could never go the length of determining that the holders of the small stakes should have no influence at all. This is to make the difference infinite; and whatever the difference in the just proportion may be, it is clear it never can be infinite.

Now as no comparison holds good beyond certain limits, so it happens in the present case, that there are two striking points in which the great joint-stock company called a state or political community, differs from the others to which it may have been compared. And these are, First, that the sacrifices demanded of the holders of the smaller stakes, are absolutely greater than those demanded from the larger; and, Secondly, that on the supposition that each individual had a vote alike, there are naturally-existing causes why the influence of the holders of the great stakes over the others,—or in other words, of the rich over the poor,—if not greater than was desirable for any good effect it would have on the common interest, would at all events not be less.

Compare now the sacrifices which a poor man is continually called upon to make to what is stated (and perhaps justly) to be for the welfare of the community. Weigh, for example, the loss and suffering to which every poor man of certain years is liable from being called on to serve in the militia, with the loss and suffering the rich man encounters from seeing the price of a substitute charged against his rental. Take the case of any other tax, and compare the relative effect of what falls on the possessor of the single ewe lamb, with what falls on the owner of the flocks on a thousand hills. Thence collect the evidence and the proof, that the poor have in reality a much more urgent personal stake in the management of the common stock, than the rich;—add to it the testimony of history that the rich, by hook or by crook, have always contrived to take care of themselves;—and see if the resulting conclusion is not, that the goodness of a government is measured by the degree in which the poor, and not the rich, have the power to take care of themselves,—in the same manner as the goodness of a crutch is measured by its fitting the lame side and not the sound.

Next, that the rich ought to be but too happy to allow an equality of suffrage to be as much as they can demand, if other people will only refrain from asking if it is not too much. And here it is plain, that by possessing the wealth, they possess a power of influencing other men, exactly proportioned to that wealth. The equality of representation is only like the equality

of right to go in at the door of a market; it does not imply the power of having equal influence when men are there. The demand therefore of the rich to have not only the influence of their wealth, but to cut off the poor from the right of representation besides, is like the assertion that they cannot enjoy their just privileges in the market, unless they can pass a law to have the poor kept out in addition. It is clear that the poor do as much as can be expected from them, if they see the rich enjoying the benefit of their riches in the market, and put up quietly with the contrast of their own inferiority;—if they content themselves with the tripe and the offal, and lovingly aid in securing to the wealthy the sirloin and the haunch. If they do this at all, it is evidently because they are aware that the same security of property which gives the rich man his sirloin, is what ensures themselves their tripe; but it by no means follows that they should extend the argument, to shutting themselves out of their homely portion besides.

The *whiggisms* that are abroad upon this question of representation, are, that the poor do not know how to take care of themselves and of the state, and that the rich do. To this the answers are, first, that the poor do not ask to direct the state by themselves, but solely as their influence may be distilled and passed through the alembic of the rich. If the poor were to ask that ten day-labourers in St. Giles's should be shut up in a box like a jury, and required to record their opinion upon state affairs before they ate or drank, and that a like process should be followed in every parish and the final result recorded as the fiat of the community,—this would be the state of things to which the objection of their adversaries applies. But this is precisely what they do not ask. They ask no more than what they may be able to secure, after the rich man has had the full benefit of his wealth and of all the power it gives him over the conduct and opinions of others. This is one part of the answer; and the other is, that the rich have had full time and opportunity to prove, that whoever may be fit to direct the conduct of the community, *they by themselves are not.* They have had it all their own way, and a strange pass they have brought things to. The drunken coachman that drives into a ditch, has not given stronger proof of his unfitness to hold the reins, than the "higher classes" as they are denominated, have given of their unfitness to be intrusted with power, except under the check arising from the admixture and combination of the other portions of the community. If the governors had been unmixed St. Giles's, they could not have brought the numerical mass of the community to greater loss and suffering, than have

been the result of the monopoly of legislation which has been allowed to the wealthy. It is not denied that they might have produced a considerable mass of evil, but it is denied that they could have produced more. Human invention could have gone no further, than spending all a nation had, by anticipation for an unjust purpose, and then prohibiting commerce by way of remedying the evil. It is not at all argued, that because the community has had the misfortune of trying one extreme, it therefore ought to try the other; but that it ought to make some endeavour at the attainment of that just medium and combination of the interests of all, which it requires no supernatural wisdom to perceive to be for the security of the whole.

Another of the sophisms of the same school, is that men and classes of men are well enough represented, if they have *some* representatives. This is the fallacy of *virtual representation.* If it is urged, that virtual representation means a representation by means of proportional parts,—as, for instance, might be the case if one man in a hundred or in a thousand were to be taken by lot and endowed with the faculty of electing the House of Commons,— then the answer is, that nothing like any such thing is in existence, and therefore it is of no use to talk about it. But what is really meant by the phrase, is to persuade the manufacturers, for instance, that they are represented, because there are *some* manufacturers in the house. Each class is to have a representative, or it may be two or three; *and those who live upon the public are to have the rest.* Now it is plain that nobody would endure such nonsense in a joint-stock company; and there is no more reason for enduring it any-where else. In a joint-stock company all classes would see that it was of importance to them not only to have *some* votes, but to have their fair proportion of votes. No man or set of men would be fooled out of their just claims, by the insinuation that it was enough if they had one vote and their opponents had the other ninety-nine.

A third falsehood of similar origin and tendency is, that there must be a King, and a House of Lords, and a House of Commons by courtesy so called,—but that the House of Commons must be the King and the House of Lords over again. It is not enough that the people be but a third estate in their own land; but they must be cut down into the third of a third, or reduced to that proportion which popular jest assigns of manhood to a tailor. Now if this meant that the king and the lords should have the just influence in the House of Commons which is inseparable from their state, and which all the law-making in the world cannot deprive them of, it would be defensible and

right. But it means no such thing. It means that they shall have that kind of influence which is procurable by nine-tenths of the persons called the commons being put out of connexion with the thing called the House of Commons altogether. Not only are the commons in the aggregate to be reduced to a tailor's share; but nine-tenths of the whole are to be cut down to no share at all. What is the use of the House of Commons to those nine-tenths? Is it for their protection? The King or the House of Lords would protect them just as well. Is it for the hearing of their complaints? They have no voice, except by the same luck that they may find one among the bench of bishops. Is it for the promotion of their happiness? It is clear that their happiness will only be attended to when everybody has done attending to his own. This is what to nine-tenths of the commons of England is the House of Commons. There is no secret in it; it is not what there is any harm in talking about; it is what is avowed, defended, boasted of. It is the thing as it ought to be,—the venerable, *et cætera*, which it is held forth to be a crime and an enormity to think of altering.

If a traveller should ever reach the moon, and should there be introduced to a population with heads beneath their shoulders, of whom nine-tenths were cut off from all influence in the regulation of their affairs, and the other tenth sold their votes at each completion of a certain number of revolutions of their planet,—he could not fail to discover that the real basis of this lunatic constitution was, that influence in the government was set up to sale to the best bidder as at Rome. The only difference would be, that instead of the empire being bought of an imperial guard, it was bought of a tenth of the population dispersed in tap-rooms without being guardsmen. Just as much organization and tendency to the well governing of the state as there was in the Roman invention, would there be in the other; the simple beauty of each is equal. And if the traveller was destined to be made merry, it would be by hearing the moon-calves that surrounded him talk of their invention as a monument of lunar wisdom, and as something adorned and perfected by the touches of successive generations of their race. The quarto which such a traveller would publish on his return, would be confirmation strong, of the notion which has connected the moon with madness, and assigned it as the resting-place of all things trumpery and false.

In the days of darkness such follies might have been winked at here on earth; in the days of power, they might have been maintained by force. But the days of both are passed; and the belief that the people have a "glorious constitution," is a gone-by tale. They know what they have, and they know

that it is *not* glorious. They see their position; and their object is to make use of what they have, in order to obtain what they have not. In this pursuit, the classes whose personal suffering takes the most substantial form are naturally foremost. The wonder is, that the classes next above, in whom has been truly said to reside the preponderating portion of the momentum of the public, should be so long in joining. They are all busy nursing the existing evils, in hopes that one son will get a commission in the army, and another in the customs. They will perhaps come to their senses at some time, and compare the value of the mess of pottage for which they sell themselves, with the value of what they abandon in return.

Suppose now, the writer of this Article were to break through the etiquette usually observed with the public, and clothe himself with so much of personality as to state, that he was the possessor of the better half of what is popularly understood to be the object of a wealthy citizen's ambition,—that he was what the French call a *millionnaire*, and something more,—not through any merit of his own, but by inheritance of the gains of successful commerce, which it is generally understood in England the gainer is permitted to make over to his children. Suppose that he has this;—a small matter compared with what some men have at stake, but still worth having;—and let him ask, in his own name and in the name of all to whom the like argument may apply, what just reason can be given why, on the supposition that he has common sense and a desire to keep his own, he should not join with all and everybody that is engaged in seeking what is known under the title of Radical Reform. Let no man be startled at the term radical; does any man but the guilty, desire a reform that is not radical? "Radical" means that which shall do something effectually; and "not radical" means not doing it at all. Does any man go to a doctor, and ask for a cure that is not radical? All men have been radicals, who ever did any good since the world began. Adam was a radical, when he cleared the first place from rubbish, for Eve to spin in. Noah was a prodigious radical, when, hearing the world was to be drowned, he went about such a common-sense proceeding as making himself a ship to swim in. A whig would have laid half a dozen sticks together for an ark, and called it a virtual representation.

What then has such a man as has been described, to gain by the continuance of the present state of things? If he is to be taxed, he has not necessarily the fragment of a share in giving his consent to it, any more than a Polish boor. He was not born a drunken artisan in a rotten borough, nor the son

of one. If he looks round upon the way in which what is taken from him by taxation is disposed of, all he sees is an organization for feeding certain people of certain classes at the expense of the remainder. He might get into parliament, and try to obtain a share of the common plunder; but for this he is too proud. He might stand up for the oppression of the poorer orders as the means of benefiting his own; but for this he is too wise. If he has children, where is he to place them? Commerce is prohibited by act of parliament; he can get them into the list of bankrupts by the expenditure of a small capital as well as of a large one. All the professions are overstocked, in consequence of the same prohibition; there are two curates in embryo for every tithe pig, nine lawyers for every possible brief, and seven doctors to each man rich enough to have the gout. If he looks at his rents, he finds nothing but negative quantities; tenants that cannot pay, coming, like impossible roots, by pairs; his income is an evanescent series, and the method of exhaustion is like to solve all problems in his book. If he turns to his connexions, he sees nothing but insolvency; the savings of the father lost by the failure of the sons, and mothers lamenting over it as the act of heaven, without finding out that it was so because the ruling powers would have it so. On looking all round the compass, he sees nothing but one great conspiracy to appropriate and gradually draw off the savings of each man's industry, in support of a plan whose scope and object is to maintain the non-industrious. No man in society can by any exertion of economy sustain his present rank and transmit it to a line of successors with the chance of their sustaining it also, except the lucky few who have a patent for keeping themselves and their descendants at the expense of the community. Men who obtain property by industry are indulged with the power of transmitting it through one or two generations; but there is a process going on, by which, like the grains in a coffee-mill, it must all come to the grinder at last. He who has money does not hold it in fee simple; but by a lease of greater or shorter length, at the end of which it must revert to that portion of the aristocracy which quarters its descendants on the public. In this state of things the marvel is, that the well-informed part of the middle classes and more particularly of the commercial classes, does not arrange itself on the side of the reformers. The commercial classes have a prejudice against what they call politics; derived from the time when commercial men were for the moment gaining largely by the spendthrift anticipation of the national expenditure, and when any commercial man found opposed to the measures of government was supposed to be so only because he was unable

to seize his share. A connexion was thus formed between politics and bankruptcy; and the prejudice continues, in spite of the change of circumstances. Nothing can account for the tameness with which commercial men submit to the prohibition of commerce, but this; combined with the operation of the foolish hope, that they shall individually pick something out of the common wreck. As all things have an end, so also must this; and the time cannot be far off, when the middle classes and those of the highest who are not entered of the plot, will come forward to join their influence to the cause of the starving poor. Commercial misery may be some stimulus, even though it does not amount to the misery of a small loaf. A man may lawfully wish to keep what he has, even though he has not yet an immediate vision of the alms-house. Everybody knows what an outcry was made about property, when the object was to establish the supremacy which has led to the present ills. The London Radical Reform Association, is virtually an association for the defence of property. It is an association to prevent all that we have from being taken by our betters. If a manufacturing operative has to preserve himself from maintaining a thousandth part of a scion of the landed aristocracy out of his platter, a man of two thousand a-year has to save himself from being saddled with a full-grown imp; and so on in proportion. The time will come when rich and poor will combine to make every man eat out of his own dish; and the actual agent in this cruel operation, will be a radical reform in what is called the commons house of parliament.

The ways in which the middle classes will exert themselves when they come forward, will be the same in which they exert themselves for other objects. They will use the legitimate power they have, to obtain the legitimate power they have not. Instead of fruitless lamentations over the wretched state of the representation, they will use that state, wretched as it is, as a stepping-stone to one that shall be better. If the empire is for sale, they will buy it with a view to repair. They will lay aside all animosities, and combine in their compact all classes where a community of interest can be proved. They will tell the clergy, for example, that whatever may be the opinion of political economists on tithes, it is clear that the working orders of the clergy have nothing to fear from change. To them all change must be for good. In the most unenlightened countries, this truth breaks out. A continental bishop may be an absolutist; but the poor man that was met galloping up Mont Cenis on his mule at sunset, to save the soul of a still-born child at the extremity of his parish of thirty miles diameter,

was to a certainty a liberal. Even the dignitaries of the English church might find out, that if their revenues are threatened, it is only as a sacrifice to maintain the landlords in the possession of the Corn-laws. Let them look at the question with the advantages their learning and talents give for it; and then let them join with the people in the prosecution of a common interest, or else give up their revenues quietly. Why should not those who fleece the people, fleece a bishop? It is not true that the interests of the church and of the people are divided on the subject. They endure a common danger; and should join for a common deliverance.

The great object of fear to the middle classes, is the apprehended violence and misdirection of those with whom they think they would have to join. They fear the orators who harp upon the bad passions of the people;—whose idea of the utility of reform is that it would create an ability for carrying on unjust wars, and whose love for liberty displays itself in exciting feelings of hostility against our brethren who have won their battles and our own on the other side of the Atlantic. There is no denying the evil; it is an obstacle the more, but it is an obstacle which, like others, must be got over. Tell them plainly, that we want no more wars for cat-skins;—that if an administration, either royalist or radical, should ever set up a claim to allowing no gun to be fired in Europe without its consent, the middle classes in England would draw off to one side, and leave it to settle the contest by itself. Tell them that if any such administration were to attempt to prescribe what ships should be built in America, the just and natural end would be that England would be put down by a coalition of all civilized states; and that the middle classes will not advance a shilling towards the promotion of such a project. Inform them, that till there is some greater security for good government, the present state of depletion is the happiest of all consummations; and that the man who would voluntarily pay a shilling to remove it, is only comparable to him who having just been bled out of a delirium, should offer a shilling to have his veins re-filled. Give them to understand that their foreign politics are pot-house, and their home ones only make men praise God for Mr. Peel. Tell them that their object is to evade the great question, which is the Corn-laws;—and that their pretence of the necessity for refusing cheap corn in order that men may be able to pay taxes, is as foolish as if a man should refuse an estate lest he should be obliged to pay a property-tax. Say to them that their best and newest plan for seizing on the savings of other men's industry in the funds, is only spoliation wrapped up;—that it is as unjust as if a crew

on short allowance were to propose to eke out an accidental relief, by saying to one part of the crew, "And you, you know, will only be on short allowance as before." Supposing the taxes and the army were reduced to their proper extent, what justice is there in saying that the fundholders shall have no benefit by it, and that it shall be enough for them if they have 30 per cent lopped off to bring them to where they were before? State clearly that the whole argument against the fundholders, consists in commencing at the year 1812 when restoration began to be made to them, and cutting off all memory of the previous sixteen years that they had been plundered. Say all this boldly and on all opportunities; and the dangerous part of those who call themselves the radicals will soon be reduced to their true value. Set up a sound and honest radicalism, against an unsound and dishonest one. Disown all abuse of existing ministers; and be persuaded, that though it is perfectly necessary that difference of opinion should go all possible lengths, it is true in the main that all ministers do as well as they can. Distrust those who say they see in themselves the signs of heaven-born counsellors, and who believe that the practice of a minister is to be learnt like cutting off a leg. Eschew violence; cultivate education, from A, B, C upwards; hurry nothing,—it will all come in time, like the breaking-up of a hard frost. Pull down an abuse where you can; especially where it is one, like that of slavery in the West-Indies, whose supporters support all the rest. Go on quietly and perseveringly, and fear nothing. There will be no revolution, no disturbance, no violent changes,—any more than when a child of a span long, turns into a grenadier. Sensible men are not to endure an evil for ever, through a vague fear of its removal being something they have not tried before. Do something; do a little; do more when you can. Keep the stone rolling; and see if you do not end by proving to all ranks and orders, except the downright plunderers, that radical is "your only wear."

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 January, 1830.

ART. XIV.—*Edinburgh Review, No. XCIX. Art. 6. On "The Utilitarian Theory of Government, and the Greatest-Happiness Principle."*

THE conductors of the Westminster Review were desirous of an opportunity of making some additional remarks upon the principle they have in two preceding Numbers had the good fortune to defend. A controversy, whatever may be its effects in approving the defensibleness of particular branches of a

system, is not always the best adapted for the orderly statement of its substance. It is possible therefore that their design may have its use ; though at some risk of incurring the scandal of repetition, and the disgrace of presenting what everybody knows. The article in the last number of the Edinburgh Review has afforded them the opportunity desired ; without materially altering the execution of their plan.

They therefore state,—for the edification of those who may be disposed to be edified by it, and without the slightest desire to interfere with the right of anybody to prefer "the keen and searching scepticism of the second Academy,"—that the substance of what they have endeavoured to maintain, when presented with more attention to order than a controversy would admit, is as follows.

First, That Morality, as applied to the conduct of individuals, is reducible to being the rule, the general observation of which would produce the greatest sum or aggregate of happiness among those who are to be affected by the consequences. That though moral precepts may have been uttered without any reference made to this principle, and many of them may have been right,—it is a reference to this principle which in disputed cases distinguishes the true from the pseudo-morality ;—which establishes, for example, that it is not a meritorious action for a man to eat his father, as in some countries has been inculcated as a duty, and that it is not criminal *per se* to drink wine, which in others has been accounted an offence. If they are asked how they know that morality is reducible to this rule, they reply, Because on comparison with any of the systems of morality which have attained to extensive acceptance among mankind, it is palpable that in by far the largest portion of their extent the rules coincide ; and that in respect of that portion in which they do not, the contest, with one solitary species of exception, has always been rested upon the effects in some shape of suffering or the contrary, on the sentient creatures that were concerned. If, for example, it was ever contended that it was a moral act for a man to kill and eat his father, it was supported on the ground that it was for the happiness of society and of themselves, that men on arriving at a certain stage of decrepitude should be put out of pain, and that it was a mark of respect for their sons to eat them. There may be doubt whether the reasoning was good ; but there is none that this *was* the reasoning. And the same in other cases. The solitary exception remarked, is where on the ground of some asserted supernatural sanction or authority, actions have been defended as consonant with the moral rule, which have been hostile to the increase of the temporal happiness of men in the

aggregate. On which peculiar description of cases it is sufficient to reply, that to make them of any weight it is requisite that it should be proved, not only that the authority referred to is unimpeachable, but that the interpretation of those who make the reference is unimpeachable also; and that none of those who have at any time brought forward a precept of the nature described, have established their title upon both these points. The Vedas, for example, may be considered as having failed upon the first point, and the Inquisition on the other. And further, that even in these cases, there has always been a virtual reference to some final advantage, which either through the influence of a supernatural power or otherwise, was to be the result of obedience.

Secondly, That though for anything they have to say to the contrary there may be a hundred different reasons why men should be moral, one reason which to a certain extent may dispense with the production of the other ninety-nine, is that the circumstances in which man is placed are such, that the habitual observance of the rule asserted to be the rule of morality, is in the long run and taking all chances together, the safest and most likely guide to the happiness of the individual. It may not be accordant with experience that in every individual case the man who lives in the breach of moral rules shall, in exteriors at least, be less happy than some other;—any more than it is accordant with experience that every man of eighty will die before every man of twenty-five. On the contrary it may be allowed to be certain, that in some instances the contrary will happen. But what is urged is, that in the same way as it is proveable by experience that a man would be a simpleton, who with all the chances before him, should chuse an annuity on the life of an average man of eighty in preference to one of twenty-five,—so it is proveable that a man commits an error and a folly, who with all the chances to encounter, chuses the quantity of happiness which shall be consequent on a course of immorality, in preference to the quantity he might have obtained by another course. The way in which each of these propositions must be established, is by individual attention to the evidence, that though now and then a man of eighty sees the funeral of a man of twenty-five, or a man of immoral conduct is (in outward appearance at least) more fortunate and happy than some one of opposite character, this does not destroy the general inference that nine times out of ten the event is of a contrary description, and that the man is a blockhead who makes his election the wrong way. If indeed anybody says he sees reason to believe, that men of eighty are on the whole better lives than those of twenty-five, or

that immoral men do upon the whole lead happier lives than moral ones, he is at perfect liberty to support his own opinion. All that is insisted on is, that there are reasons sufficient to induce the greatest part of mankind to come to a contrary conclusion.

Thirdly, That the principle after being elucidated and established in the simpler case of individuals, is transferable to the operations of masses or combinations of men,—as for example, notably, to the conduct of those collections of influential persons who regulate the affairs of others under the title of governments, and to the conduct of independent nations in their behaviour towards each other. The interest of those who are in these cases to be acted upon, in receiving the greatest happiness, it seems unnecessary to go about to prove ; the point in question relates to the happiness of the actors. And here the object is to establish as in accordance with the dictates of a sound and enlightened experience, that though there is no certainty that in any individual case the rule which would produce the greatest aggregate of happiness will be attended with the greatest happiness to the party whose mode of action is in question, there is a certainty that the habitual observance of the rule will on the whole be the most likely guide to the happiness of this very party. It may not be absolutely certain that a particular government or nation which conducts itself according to the rule of the general happiness shall not be unfortunate ;—but it is absolutely certain, that if all the instances in which governments or nations have acted according to the rule be compared with those in which they have not, the comparative result will be found vastly in favour of the former. This may not be as much as some could have found in their hearts to wish ;—they may think it would have been very useful if it had been regulated, that every man who stole should die of an apoplexy the next week. But it is as much as Providence has chosen to give ; and quite enough for wise men to act upon.

An important fact connected with these propositions is, that as men advance in civilization and improvement, the closeness of the connexion between morality and particular happiness increases. In such a progressive state of general society, the actual proportion of cases in which immorality (personal, governmental, or national) is not attended with greater suffering in the end, may be viewed as continually decreasing, in the same manner that the number of men of eighty who mourn at the funerals of their grandchildren is likely to be diminished. As the accidents by which men are exposed to be hurried to a premature death are on the decrease, and the appliances by which

they are assisted to attain old age are on the increase,—so in the moral case, the combinations of society to connect suffering with guilt are continually gaining strength, and the power and opportunities of those who would oppose it are declining. Cacus had but one Hercules to guard against; but a robber of the diligence between Paris and Turin, has two legions of gendarmerie. In the same manner with respect to the crimes of nations, the feeling of community of interest with the sufferers is everywhere augmented, and the conviction of any real interest in the participation of the crime, among the citizens of the aggressive state, is everywhere diminished. The zeal for retribution, and the knowledge of the means, combine in all directions to increase the force of God's natural check upon iniquity and wrong.

After having laid down the motives which should induce all individuals without exception to concur in promoting the greatest happiness, it was an easy inference that if the happiness of men is to be the object of government, the object is to be obtained by their being governed with a view to their own interest, and not to the interest of somebody else; and that the way to effect this is, that they should govern themselves, or at all events hold an effectual check over those to whom the reins of government are committed. And this led to those conclusions on the subject of modes of government, which it is unnecessary to repeat.

Whether all this is right, is known perhaps to beings in a higher state of existence than our own; and is certainly not known to every man who has attained to the faculty of writing in a three-monthly Review. But if it is not right, it has very much the air of leading to what is right. Whenever it is proved capable of improvement, the degradation of amendment shall be submitted to. To gain with labour and hold fast with pains, is the way in which man is doomed to come by knowledge; with the exception of that peculiar class, who come from the hands of the maker as perfect as they ever are.

The remainder of the paper will consist of replies to objections from the Edinburgh Review and other quarters; beginning with such as relate to the general principle.

'What earthly good can there be in a principle upon which no man will act until he is all-wise? A certain most important doctrine, we are told, has been demonstrated so clearly, that it ought to be the foundation of the science of government. And yet the whole frame of government is to be constituted, exactly as if this fundamental doctrine were false, and on the supposition that no human being will ever act as if he believed it to be true!'—*Ed. Rev. XCIX. p.* 118.

The substitution of one proposition for another. It was never

stated that no man will act upon the principle till he is all-wise; but that if he was all-wise he would act upon it. If men were all-wise, they would be honest. But it does not follow that nobody will be honest, but one that is all-wise. The truth that if men were all-wise they would be honest, may be demonstrated ever so clearly upon paper; and yet form no reason why government should not be constituted upon the supposition that men will not be honest after all.

'To say that a man does what he believes to be against his happiness, is a contradiction in terms. If, therefore, government and laws are to be constituted on the supposition on which Mr. Mill's Essay is founded, that all individuals will, whenever they have power over others put into their hands, act in opposition to the general happiness, then government and laws must be constituted on the supposition that no individual believes, or ever will believe, his own happiness to be identical with the happiness of society. That is to say, government and laws are to be constituted on the supposition that no human being will ever be satisfied by Mr. Bentham's proof of his "greatest happiness principle,"—a supposition which may be true enough, but which says little, we think, for the principle in question.'—*p.* 118.

Mr. Mill's proposition was, that all men will abuse power *when nothing checks;* and therefore it is the interest of the community to multiply checks. It may be quite true that men would be honest if they were wise; and yet form no reason why the prevention of dishonesty should be taken out of the hands of law and government, and trusted to the operation of the precept of morality. The real object is to check dishonesty by the exertions of the law, and to check it by the dissemination of the principle that dishonesty is bad policy besides.

'Nothing can be more absurd than to suppose, like the Westminster Reviewer, that thieves steal only because they do not calculate the chances of being hanged as correctly as honest men.'—*p.* 120.

It never was supposed that they steal *only* for that reason. "*Only*" is an insertion.

'It never seems to have occurred to him as possible, that a man may so greatly prefer the life of a thief to the life of a labourer, that he may determine to brave the risk of detection and punishment, though he may even think that risk greater than it really is. And how, on Utilitarian principles, is such a man to be convinced that he is in the wrong? "You will be found out."—"Undoubtedly."—"You will be hanged within two years."—"I expect to be hanged within one year."—"Then why do you pursue this lawless mode of life?"—"Because I would rather live for one year with plenty of money, dressed like a gentleman, eating and drinking of the best, frequenting public places, and visiting a dashing mistress, than break stones on

the road, or sit down to the loom, with the certainty of attaining a good old age. - It is my humour. Are you answered?"—*p.* 120.

The sophism is in stating, that it is his humour, therefore it is wise. The question was, whether it is not capable of being demonstrated to the satisfaction of men in general, and with a manifest tendency to dissuade from the vocation of a thief,—that if all the pleasures and pains of the thief be put together, he has a worse balance on winding up the account than an honest man. It is no answer to this to say, that the thief voluntarily prefers the enjoyment of the credit side of the account at the present moment, and shuts his eyes to the other. The spendthrift tradesman does the same; but it does not follow that the balance is finally in his favour. It is very possible for a man to do a foolish act; and it is not the less foolish because he *chose* to do it. To say that the man chuses which he likes best, and must therefore always have his greatest happiness, is a mere evasion. The question was, whether of two things set before him, an individual may not chuse the worst. The answer given is, that the fact of his chusing necessarily makes it the best. The caution of the nurse is, "Avoid green gooseberries, or you will have cause to rue." The answer of the baby is, "I like to have green gooseberries; and therefore I can never have cause to rue." The immoral man, like the baby, acts under a most imperfect consciousness of the real comparative value of the two sides of the account. He sees the one under the favouring aspect of immediate certainty of enjoyment; and the other under a false estimate, or an almost total ignorance, both of its actual magnitude and of the chances of escape. The baby runs all risks for the present gratification of a very paltry appetite; but vastly altered is its estimate of things, when the gripes come upon it like an armed man. According to the Edinburgh Review, the gripes are its greatest happiness. In the same manner, the thief who steals to the amount of twenty shillings and gets hanged for it, would assuredly never have done it if he had made a sober estimate of the pleasures of twenty shillings and the actual unpleasantness of hanging by the neck, together with a correct judgment of the probabilities that one would be consequent upon the other. The fact is, that he makes no estimate at all, or none that approaches to correctness. He opens his eyes wide to the twenty shillings, and winks and runs his head into the disgraceful noose; and because he chuses to do this, he is to be held to have obtained his greatest happiness. Hogarth's "Idle Apprentice" is a representation of the greatest happiness of the Edinburgh Review.

But it is practicable to go further. It is possible to borrow from theology, and ask, why the man who is supposed to do amiss and incur perpetual punishment in another world in return, is not to be allowed to have got his greatest happiness. He has had his choice,—he has taken that which he preferred to take,—as well as any of the rest. It follows, therefore, by evident connexion, that to this man, hell was his greatest happiness.

'A king, says the Reviewer again, would govern well if he were wise, for fear of provoking his subjects to insurrection. Therefore, the true happiness of a king is identical with the greatest happiness of society. Tell Charles II. that if he will be constant to his queen, sober at table, regular at prayers, frugal in his expenses, active in the transaction of business; if he will drive the herd of slaves, buffoons, and procurers from Whitehall, and make the happiness of his people the rule of his conduct, he will have a much greater chance of reigning in comfort to an advanced age; that his profusion and tyranny have exasperated his subjects, and may, perhaps, bring him to an end as terrible as his father's. He might answer, that he saw the danger, but that life was not worth having without ease and vicious pleasures. And what has our philosopher to say? Does he not see that it is no more possible to reason a man out of liking a short life and a merry one more than a long life and a dull one, than to reason a Greenlander out of his train oil? We may say that the tastes of the thief and the tyrant differ from ours; but what right have we to say, looking at this world alone, that they do not pursue their greatest happiness very judiciously?'—*p.* 120.

The question was not whether the argument should produce a certain effect on a given thief or tyrant, but whether it may not produce the effect of dissuading some men somewhere from theft and tyranny. If it does this, it produces good, whether it proves effectual upon a given individual or not. The demonstration of the perils attendant on profusion and tyranny might not be effectual on Charles II; but it does not follow that it may not be effectual on somebody else. A given Greenlander may not be to be persuaded out of his train oil; but it might be possible to lay the foundations for persuading some future Greenlander, that claret is the better of the two.

'It is the grossest ignorance of human nature to suppose that another man calculates the chances differently from us, merely because he does what, in his place, we should not do. Every man has his tastes and propensities, which he is disposed to gratify at a risk and expense, which people of different temperaments and habits think extravagant.'—*p.* 121.

Men have sufficient community of feeling to enable them to pronounce with considerable certainty on the comparative value of different pains and pleasures, whoever may be the sub-

ject. The theory of the Edinburgh Review is, that the thief may possess a peculiar gust in the joys of profligacy, and an idiosyncrasy for diminishing the pains of hanging, the torment of perpetual fear, and the sufferings of remorse,—of which the man who is not a thief has no right to form any apprehension. To which it may be replied, that not only there is no proof that anything of this kind exists, but that there is proof to the opposite effect, of as strong a nature as to the fact that fire burns one man as well as another, or to any other community of feeling, though it cannot be established by an absolute exchange of personal consciousness.

'——take the man whose votes, ever since he has sate in Parliament, have been the most uniformly bad, and oppose him to the man whose votes have been the most uniformly good.—Now, does any rational man think, that the one runs more risk of coming to a miserable end, on account of his public conduct, than the other? The first does not know that he is not close on the moment when he will be made an example of. But he has no more reason to expect that he shall be made an example of, than to expect that London will be swallowed up by an earthquake next spring; and it would be as foolish in him to act on the former supposition as on the latter.'—*p.* 121.

So said the sinners that were before the flood;—and before its great political parallel, the French Revolution. All this might have been said to any active member of the French government for the century that preceded; and still the Revolution came at last, and vindicated the soundness of the principle in question. Take the happiness of the members of the American government during the fifty years it has existed,—take also the happiness of the Stuarts and their courtiers, or any other race who have governed notoriously ill, and make a proper allowance for the misery which has come upon them in those seasons when they were brought to a reckoning for their misconduct;—divide the resulting masses fairly among the individuals concerned;—and let any thinking man decide for himself, on which side he should wish his lot to be cast, if the whole, with all its chances and uncertainties, was to come over again. If he decides for the Americans, it is proof that *he* at least, is of opinion that conduct like that of the Stuarts is unwise.

'A thief is condemned to be hanged. On the eve of the day fixed for the execution, a turnkey enters his cell, and tells him that all is safe, that he has only to slip out, that his friends are waiting in the neighbourhood with disguises, and that a passage is taken for him in an American packet. Now, it is clearly for the greatest happiness of society that the thief should be hanged, and the corrupt turnkey exposed and punished. Will the Westminster Reviewer tell us, that

'it is for the greatest happiness of the thief to summon the head jailer' and tell the whole story? Now, either it is for the greatest happiness of a thief to be hanged, or it is not. If it is, then the argument, by which the Westminster Reviewer attempts to prove, that men do not promote their own happiness by thieving, falls to the ground. If it is not, then there are men whose greatest happiness is at variance with the greatest happiness of the community.'—*p*. 122.

The case produced in opposition, is itself the most awful exemplification of the rule. The proposition is, that men risk suffering, by breaches of the law of general happiness. And the objection offered is, that a man may bring himself to such a state, that he shall have no means to escape a shameful death but by a further infraction of the law. Suppose the rule supported was, that men risk their health by dram-drinking. But, says the opponent, there are men who have brought themselves to such a state by dram-drinking, that they could not survive a day without taking a quantity of drams; is it possible to maintain in this case, that dram-drinking is unwholesome? The answer to which is, that the state to which the man is reduced, is itself the most powerful proof of the verity of the rule. In the same manner the argument with the novice who is thinking of putting on the vocation of a thief, should be, that he will have made an awfully bad choice if he comes to be sentenced to be hanged, with no chance but that of allowing the turnkey to take him a passage to America.

'We say, that if the "greatest-happiness principle," as now stated, be sound, Mr. Mill's Essay, and all other works concerning Government, which, like that Essay, proceed on the supposition, that individuals may have an interest opposed to the greatest happiness of society, are fundamentally erroneous.'—*p*. 122.

A confusion between temporary or apparent interest, and ultimate or real.

'We say, that those who hold this principle to be sound, must be prepared to maintain, either that monarchs and aristocracies may be trusted to govern the community, or else that men cannot be trusted to follow their own interest, when that interest is demonstrated to them.'—*p*. 123.

Nothing is more undeniable, than that men cannot be trusted to follow their own interest, merely because pains have been taken to demonstrate it to them. The fallacy is in the word "demonstrated;" which may mean either "impressed on the mind so as to produce perfect conviction and belief," or "laid down in a printed demonstration in a book." The last of these meanings makes no dilemma; it was intended therefore that the proposition should be granted in this sense, and interpreted in the other.

'We say, that if men cannot be trusted to follow their own interest, when that interest has been demonstrated to them, then the Utilitarian arguments, in favour of universal suffrage, are good for nothing.' —*p.* 123.

The same fallacy as before. Men *may* be trusted to follow their own interest, if they have an intimate persuasion of what their interest is, and are persuaded right. Men have already attained to so much knowledge of their true interest, as to lead the Utilitarians to maintain, that for them to have the power also, would be the most likely way to cause their true interest to be enforced.

'We say, that the "greatest-happiness principle" has not been proved; that it cannot be generally proved; that even in the particular cases selected by the Reviewer it is not clear that the principle is true; and that many cases might be stated in which the common sense of mankind would at once pronounce it to be false.'—*p.* 123.

Everything depends upon opinion. Some men look through the world, and come to the conclusion that honesty is the best policy; others do the same, and come to the conclusion that it is not. There is a wide and increasing schism between these two parties; and nothing that has been said in the Edinburgh Review is likely to end it.

'The Westminster Reviewer charges us with urging it as an objection to the "greatest-happiness principle," that "it is included in the Christian morality." This is a mere fiction of his own. We never attacked the morality of the Gospel. We blamed the Utilitarians for claiming the credit of a discovery, when they had merely stolen that morality, and spoiled it in the stealing. They have taken the precept of Christ, and left the motive; and they demand the praise of a most wonderful and beneficial invention, when all that they have done has been to make a most useful maxim useless by separating it from its sanction. On religious principles, it is true that every individual will best promote his own happiness by promoting the happiness of others. But if religious considerations be left out of the question, it is not true. If we do not reason on the supposition of a future state, where is the motive? If we do reason on that supposition, where is the discovery?—*p.* 123.

It was not said that the being included in the Christian morality was urged as an "objection to the greatest-happiness principle;" but that it was urged as an "objection"—manifestly not to the principle, but to the use there was in bringing it into notice. The Edinburgh Review is too fond of interpolation. The answer to the objection has been given before. But if it is necessary to dilate upon the subject, it must be stated, that since after nearly two thousand years, only one sixth of the population of the world have adopted the precepts of Christianity as their rule of conduct, there is some utility in deducing

both a rule and a motive, which shall be applicable to the service of the other five. Either there is a possibility of doing this, or the Creator has left on the lowest possible computation more than nineteen-twentieths of the human beings that have existed, without the possibility of having either. There is no reason in supposing the last; nor does it accord with the authority to which the Edinburgh Reviewers profess to refer everything. The scriptures to which they refer, contain numerous admissions that the nations who never heard of Christianity had the means of ascertaining a moral rule. Large portions of those who profess Christianity make no scruple of avowing, that they believe it because its precepts agree with a sound morality; in fact Christians with scarcely an exception, appeal to the pureness of its morality as evidence of truth. The teachers of Christianity too, in determining what *is* their morality, continually appeal to some other rule, which on being examined will be found to be the rule of the general happiness. For example, the command when smitten on one check to turn the other, has by none been interpreted literally. It has always been assumed to be limited by a rational regard to the consequences of obedience. Even the great precept of "doing to others as we would they should do to us," is limited in the same manner. It is possible that if the experiment was made on a beggar, he might find in his heart to desire his rich neighbour to give him half his property, and marry him to his daughter. But no person has ever contended that this ought to be the interpretation; and for no reason that can be assigned, but that it would be contrary to the well-being of mankind. Again, if men professing Christianity in these latter times are much less disposed to commit atrocious actions on the plea of religious duty than in former ages,—if massacres and burnings for the love of heaven have been rarer,—it seems to be mainly attributable to the influence which what may be termed natural morality has obtained over the interpreters. The men who massacred and burnt, had the precepts of the gospel in their mouths, as much as any who live in the present day. The precepts of the gospel, therefore, have received from natural morality a most beneficial aid. All these considerations go to prove, that the Creator has given men the natural means of ascertaining a moral rule, and that the rule is no other than the general happiness. But if they have the power of finding a rule, it appears to be almost a contradiction in terms to suppose that they have not the power of finding a motive. A rule without a motive, is no rule at all. The rule of the greatest happiness evidently includes the motive; and wants nothing but the expansion of the process by which the happiness of the individual is involved in that of the species.

Another reason why the importance of the "greatest-happiness principle" is not absorbed in the coincidence of the Christian precepts, is that it applies to combinations of men in their aggregate capacity. Granting that the religious sanction applies to the conduct of individuals,—it by no means applies with equal vigour to the conduct of communities. It may be urged, that it applies to the individuals who compose the community, and this is enough. But the "greatest-happiness principle" applies to individuals, and to communities besides. In addition to the motives held out to individuals by both principles, the earthly principle says to nations, that it is for their ultimate interest to deal justly towards each other. It would be difficult to say what motive the religious principle holds out to nations in their corporate capacity; for it certainly does not threaten them *en masse*, with the "sanction" alluded to by the Edinburgh Reviewers. And the consequence has been, that if Christian men have had small morality, Christian states have had less. It is notorious that many of the worst acts of Christian nations, have been committed under the direction of men who as individuals had not the least idea of missing heaven. It would be thought hard and severe in any man, who should threaten a bad administration with sending them individually to the devil. The true check on bad administrations, is in setting before them the risk of present ruin, and of future if not present disgrace. Will the reputation of the conductors of the American and anti-revolutionary wars, be any prize in a lottery a century hence? Will the fame of Pitt be "*bella*"? It seems established therefore, that the principle contended for is at all events capable of doing good service in the political department, and has the field almost entirely to itself.

After this it may be useful to go back to the objections which relate peculiarly to the propositions of Mr. Mill on government.

'If we assume that the object of government is the preservation of the persons and property of men, then we must hold that wherever that object is attained, there the principle of good government exists. If that object be attained, both in Denmark and in the United States of America, then that which makes government good must exist, under whatever disguise of title or name, both in Denmark and in the United States. If men lived in fear for their lives and their possessions under Nero and under the National Convention, it follows that the causes from which misgovernment proceeds, existed both in the despotism of Rome, and in the democracy of France. What, then, is that which, being found in Denmark and in the United States, and not being found in the Roman empire, or under the administration of Robespierre, renders governments, widely differing in their external form, practically good? Be it what it may, it certainly is not that

which Mr. Mill proves *à priori* that it must be,—a democratic representative assembly. For the Danes have no such assembly.'

'The latent principle of good government ought to be tracked, as it appears to us, in the same manner in which Lord Bacon proposed to track the principle of Heat. Make as large a list as possible, said that great man, of those bodies in which, however widely they differ from each other in appearance, we perceive heat; and as large a list as possible of those which, while they bear a general resemblance to hot bodies, are nevertheless not hot. Observe the different degrees of heat &c.'—*p.* 101.

There is no need for going through all that has been said by the great man. The latent principle had been tracked by Mr. Mill long ago, and uttered in one word, "check." It consists in the possession of the virtual power of interference, on the part of the governed. The Danes and Americans had this power; and the Romans and French had not. The Danish people had it by virtue of their accidental position, which enabled them to keep two other forces in a state of balance, by the power of acting with either against the other; and they had it in spite of the absence of the forms of popular representation. The French people had the forms of representation, but not the effective power. In defiance of both these anomalies, it is perfectly possible that the forms of popular representation, combined with the power, may constitute the rational and practical mode of promoting good government. The rational and practical way of causing an individual to be taken care of, is to allow him to take care of himself. There have been individuals who have not been allowed to take care of themselves, and have yet been taken good care of. There have been individuals who have been allowed to take care of themselves, and have not been taken good care of after all. Both these are anomalies; but neither of them destroys the general rule. The general rule is that which is alone applicable to the simple case; the cases where it is not applicable, are complicated by the intervention of some fortuitous circumstance. It would be unreasonable to say to nations in general, "If you want to enjoy good government, make yourselves a balanced monarchy and aristocracy, as there was in Denmark;"—just as it would be unreasonable to say to men in general, "If you want to take care of yourselves, get somebody else to take care of you," because in a single case it answered.

'The Utilitarian doctrine then is, not that despots and aristocracies will always plunder and oppress the people to the last point, but that they will do so if nothing checks them.'

'In the first place, it is quite clear that the doctrine thus stated is of no use at all, unless the force of the checks be estimated, The first law of motion is, that a ball once projected will fly on to all eternity

with undiminished velocity, unless something checks. The fact is, that a ball stops in a few seconds after proceeding a few yards with very variable motion. Every man would wring his child's neck, and pick his friend's pocket, if nothing checked him. In fact, the principle thus stated, means only that governments will oppress, unless they abstain from oppressing.'—*p.* 104.

It no more means so, than a ball's moving till something checks, means only that it will move unless it abstains from moving.

'It is evidently on the real distribution of power, and not on names and badges, that the happiness of nations must depend. The representative system, though doubtless a great and precious discovery in politics, is only one of the many modes in which the democratic part of the community can efficiently check the governing few. That certain men have been chosen as deputies of the people,—that there is a piece of paper stating such deputies to possess certain powers,—these circumstances in themselves constitute no security for good government. Such a constitution nominally existed in France; while, in fact, an oligarchy of committees and clubs trampled at once on the electors and the elected. Representation is a very happy contrivance for enabling large bodies of men to exert their power, with less risk of disorder than there would otherwise be. But, assuredly, it does not of itself give power.'—*p.* 109.

The answer to all this appears to be, that Mr. Mill undoubtedly spoke of representation accompanied by power, and not of representation deprived of it. At the same time it is not true that the connexion between representation and power is one of simple accident. There may have been cases where they have been separated; but the general and natural tendency of possessing the representation, is to give the power. There may have been men who had a sword and still could not defend themselves. But it does not follow, that to have a sword, is not a considerable step towards defence.

The special pleading of the Reviewers on the subject of "sensual pleasures," is only an effort to lead off from the point in question. If by the "sensual pleasures" of a king or an aristocracy, they meant to define such pleasures cut off from all wherewith kings and aristocracies necessarily accompany them, they might as well have stated that it costs comparatively little to find a king or an aristocracy in small beer. What they really intended was, to reduce and cut down the estimate of the cost of sensual pleasures, and huddle up the reckoning of the remainder by hastening to descant on the appetite for good opinion. The sensual pleasures of a king differ from those of a cobbler, as much as their liquors. The Reviewers desire to reckon only for the water that is in the king's Tokay; and to represent everything that makes it a kingly draught, as referable to another account.

Objections will next be noticed from other sources. It has been stated in a quarter entitled to the most friendly attention*, that the principle of Mr. Bentham ought to be limited to its operation on governments, and that its application to individual morality is a burdensome addition. To this it may be replied, that in the first place, the application is true, and for the reasons already stated is not without considerable value in itself; and secondly, that the application to the simpler case is the best method of introducing and illustrating its application to the more complex. Men have already made considerable progress in the comprehension and practical use of the principle in the first form; it is therefore politic to enter the wedge by this end, with a view to the introduction of the remainder.

It has been objected from another quarter, that "the magnificent law that was declared to be of such positive utility, is reduced to the working of a *probable* good." This is a confusion between uncertainty in individual cases, and uncertainty in the aggregate. There may be uncertainty in one individual of twenty-five surviving another of eighty; but there is no uncertainty in the fact that men of twenty-five are on the whole the better lives. To say that the rule which tells a man to prefer an annuity on a life of twenty-five to one of eighty, is only the enunciation of a *probable* good, would present the same mistake as in the objection. If every man of twenty-five had been certain of surviving every man of eighty, and every immoral act had been certain of being punished without the possibility of escape, there could have been no disinclination to note the fact. But as nature has willed otherwise, the next thing to be done is to note the *average* certainty which she has chosen to decree.

Another objection has consisted in "begging to be informed what is the rule that is best for the general happiness;" and subjoining, that "if it is to be left to the private judgment of individuals to decide upon what is best for the general happiness, the principle is useless, because mankind will never agree upon the mode of carrying it into effect." This is only quarrelling with a principle that goes a certain length, because it does not go farther. It is perfectly true that there remains the question of what *is* for the general happiness. But the virtue of the previous proposition consisted in having reduced the question from a state of greater difficulty to a state of less. It is much easier to judge with some accuracy whether a given practice tends to the promotion of the general happiness, than to determine whether it is moral or immoral without the

* *Examiner*, about the time of date.—*Added in* 1839.

intervention of any such clue. For the palpable fact is, that men have a considerable aptitude for judging of what is for the general happiness. They are all capable of forming a very tolerable theory—*for their neighbours*. Men may fight shy of the truth for some particular purpose; but the practical reality is, that on most points their knowledge is nearly as perfect as can be desired. There may be some debateable ground after all; but the extent on which there can be no general debate is incomparably greater.

In all that has preceded, reference has been made to habits, and not to insulated acts. The differences between single acts of immorality and their habitual repetition, have been exhausted by writers to whom it is unnecessary to refer.

The final inference impressed by the whole case is, that the friends of the "greatest happiness" have only to persevere, to arrive at the firmest establishment of their principle. They are wrong if they think all that is necessary has been done somewhere to their hands already; the battle is still to finish, though the good position is their own. What is wanted, is the laborious and extensive illustration of the various ways in which national and political invasions of the law of the greatest happiness work to produce their own punishment. The world has been deluged with illustrations of the corresponding truth in personal morality. All dying speeches are portions of it; not a father that places his son as an apprentice, but adds his fragment to the testimony. There wants a collection of dying speeches of nefarious governments. It would not be difficult to make something of this kind out of the history of the Stuarts. France could supply something like it from periods of her history. The kingdoms of the Peninsula may be considered as in that state where the dying speech is in everybody's hands before the man is dead. The antiquary might go back to Rome, and the orientalist to Babylon. One of the first consequences of this resolute prosecution of the principle, would be the abandonment of the theological argument against it, as happened in the case of the geologists. Everybody knows the kind of persecution a geologist was exposed to a few years ago, if he ventured to make any portion of the world more ancient than ultra theologians thought proper. The geologists persevered; and now all rational theologians are glad to support their own system by such facts as they can collect from the observations of the geologists. In the same manner let the friends of the greatest happiness persevere; and they will soon find theologians anxious only to have the benefit of such support as they may derive from the establishment of a coincidence between their rules. There is no war between Christianity and philosophy. Pure and undefiled Christianity is sound philoso-

phy. If there ever has been war, it has been against the temporal abuses which pretences of religion were brought forward to protect. This was at the bottom of the outcry made against philosophy during the French Revolution. The real struggle was against arbitrary power sheltering itself under the influence of religious establishments. Religion was assailed because it was made an engine in the hands of the common enemy; the animosity was against the enemy, not against the abstract instrument that was in his hands. Those times are past. It is all too late now, to get up a religious opposition to the exercise of reason on any subject connected with the welfare of mankind*.

PROGRAMME to the WESTMINSTER REVIEW for 1 April, 1830.

IT is now a year since the Westminster Review re-appeared under a new arrangement which has since been prosecuted with all the vigour the conductors could supply. Considering their publication as the organ of a great and increasing party, THE PARTY OF THE PEOPLE,—they have allowed no important question to pass, without an unshrinking exposition of what appeared to be the real interest of the community upon the point. The subjects which in the course of this year have been presented to them, have been of no ordinary magnitude; and they are able to congratulate themselves that on some of the most important they have been supported by the final decision of the public, while on others there are strong appearances of a rapid approximation to the same conclusion.

In pursuance of their general object, the proprietors desire to direct attention to their system of cheap republication. By this method; an Article on a subject of popular interest may be put into the hands of a multitude of readers, at an expense which can be an object of importance to few; and scarcely any friend to the principles of the work can be so situated, as to be unable occasionally to promote their extension, by the introduction of a pamphlet in a quarter which it would not otherwise have reached. To the labouring classes in particular, it is conceived that a substantial source of information, not unmingled with amusement, may in this manner be opened. The powerful, the represented classes, the "interests," can afford to pay for whatever flatters or supports them; but the *people*, whom these combinations have made poor, must be furnished with

* As the authorship of the articles on one side of the above controversy is now avowed, there can apparently be no impropriety in stating that those on the other side were attributed at the time of their appearance to Mr. T. Macaulay.—1839.

cheap literature, if they are to be reached by literature at all.

By this and other methods, the quantity of matter put into circulation has been extended to a magnitude equal to that of four thousand numbers of the Review quarterly; or if an addition is made for the reprinting and amplification of the "Catechism on the Corn Laws" and "Theory of Rent" (which may fairly enough be done in an estimate of the exertions of the proprietors), to five thousand five hundred, being more than treble the previous amount. In some cases, as in the instances of the Articles on the Catholic Question and on Slavery, the copies of a single article in one way or other laid before the public have amounted to thirty thousand. The knowledge of these facts, it is hoped, will encourage many persons to be assistant in promoting the further circulation of the whole. The proprietors take the opportunity to intimate, that they shall in no case consider their property infringed on, by the publication of separate Articles, or portions of Articles, in any form accompanied with a reference to the Review as the source; and that as an inducement to associations and individuals to commence taking the work, the earlier numbers, to the year 1828 inclusive, may be received on considerably reduced terms, through application to the local Agents.

Jan. 31, 1830.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW. 1 April, 1830.

ART. X.—*Taxes on Literature. "The Six" Acts.*

IF a number of individuals had constructed a machine of great complexity and serious expense, in the final working of which they were all deeply and irrevocably interested, to the extent of the whole wealth of each being dependent on the dividend which should arise from its performance;—the feeblest of all policies, in the opinion of men of the ordinary calibre of intellect, would be one which should derange or interfere with the general result, by making a deduction of sixpence *in the oil.*

If a merchant, a philosopher, or a man of literature, were asked what it was that insured the movement of that part of the machine of society in which he is specially concerned, he would reply that it was the facility which the modern state of society and art afforded for communicating the knowledge of his operations. He would state, in brief, that the invention of printing, accompanied by the liberty of using it, was what had enabled men to become richer, wiser, and more scientific than their forefathers. He would not say it was the moving force; because it is plain that the moving force resides in the desire common to all men, to do and learn everything by which they

may better their condition. But he would say it was what had given freedom to the communication of one man's thoughts, aspirations, and discoveries, to the corresponding wishes and capabilities of other men, and had thereby ultimately brought about the accumulation of mutual action which distinguishes the present movement of the machine.

But though the merchant, the philosopher, or the man of literature, may have all this at his fingers' ends, the politician for some reason or other is still a day's march behind. It might be supposed to have been equally clear, that a tax upon the oil-pot of the national engine could be no gain in the end to those whose power, influence and dignity, depended on the magnitude of the total forces of which the direction was to be wielded by themselves. It might have been expected that under such circumstances, statesmen would have been seen running about with the important faces of steam navigators in a storm, and begging that no lady or gentleman would elbow the boy who kept the machinery in grease. No anxiety of this kind, however, appears hitherto to have disturbed their repose. Your statesman, in general, is a great admirer of "the good the gods provide him;" and little anxious to compare the Thais by his side, with even a wilderness of nymphs a little farther off. A tax is to him a tax; and he has small idea of giving up one to-day, for the expectation of twenty to-morrow. He has a lively faith that in one way or other he shall get all he wants; and he leaves to his providers to debate upon the greater or less economy of his proceedings.

On no other ground is it possible to account for so apparently irrational a proceeding, as levying, in what calls itself a great mercantile country, a tax of 155,000*l.* a-year upon advertisements,—at the expense of causing all merchants, tradesmen, booksellers, and attorneys, to get for six, eight, or ten shillings, what they otherwise would have for one. In no other way can it be held credible that a government should not discern, that all it compasses by this most pitiful effort of taxation, is gained at the expense of future advantages of vastly greater moment,—and is in truth of a cast of policy greatly inferior to that which directed the killing of the goose to get at the eggs, or any other folly which has been embalmed in proverbs or preserved in rhymes.

But if *this* be "foolishness," what shall be said of a tax upon a nation's news?—a tax which declares there shall be a premium upon the ignorance of all present things, and holds out a reward to every man who will be content to live in this world as not being of it? And this leads straight down upon the explanation of the whole. There are depths of unreason-

ableness, which surpass all human folly, and are only soluble on the hypothesis of crime. The gone-by government to which we owe this monument of shame, was the enemy of information, because the extension of information was its deadliest foe. It was a government whose proceedings would have been impracticable, under a state of public information equal, for example, to that of the present period; and consequently its first interest was to do all that might retard those advances, which it could not totally prevent, and which have not been prevented accordingly. It is no answer to say, that the imposition pressed equally on the communication of the sentiments of all parties. It is clear that in its operation it was a *British* neutrality,—all on one side. The powerful, the grasping, the unjust,—the individuals who meditated, and were permitted to succeed in bringing on, the present misery of the suffering multitude,—were partially affected by it, or not at all. The sweet morsel was under their tongues, and they could afford to pay a stamp-duty to keep it there. But the losers were the many, who were the poor; the scattered, the uninstructed, the men who knew little and were only half-inclined to know more, the individuals who were trembling on the balance between light and darkness, likely enough to imbibe dangerous knowledge if it lay in their way, or to throw up their caps for all despotisms in all countries if it could be withheld from them*. Nobody can look back on the period when this disgraceful tax had its origin, without perceiving that the crime of newspapers was that they treated of all knowable things, and it was no more the interest of the government of those degrading times (now happily sunk in the slough of history), that its subjects should make progress in the knowledge of all knowable things, than it is the interest of the Georgian slaveholder to educate the negro he is determined to oppress. There are diversities in honour and in dishonour; as one star differs from another in glory. The Georgian statesman summarily makes it capital for his black to read; the British only visited his white, with a fine of fourpence-halfpenny for each offence. Compare in the two cases the certainty, the promptitude, and the profitableness of the punishment; and it will give the measure of the comparative ability with which the two statesmen went about to compass their design.

* 'There is hardly a town of 8,000 or 10,000 persons in the United States, that does not support its daily newspaper. With the exception of the metropolis, there is not one daily newspaper in Great Britain. In the metropolis there are but twelve, to a population of 1,500,000 souls. To what is this marked depression to be attributed? *The duty is 266 per cent.*'—*Spectator Newspaper.*

Look here, Americans, and see what it is that will be stopped, if ever you come to be governed by "the higher orders."

But it would be a blank account if the reckoning stopped here. There were further enactments against the press, making part of what are known to gods and men by the title of "the Six Acts;" and in consequence of that fatality by which all things bad are in this country preserved for the chance of future use, they still hang up in the armoury of the law, and wait only for a hand to take them down and send to their vocation. It is true they are so tyrannous, that no one in this age would *wish* to use them, unless he saw an immediate peril to his cause sufficient for the risk. All men say they will not use them; no man dares use them; but the will and the daring are dependent only on the absence of inducement. So long as they are sedulously preserved, it is clear that there is a lurking hope that somebody will both will and dare, whenever the time comes that the users may be advantaged by it.

Since the spirit of an enactment is to be gathered from its company, it is by no means irrelevant to glance at the bearing of all the Acts known by the opprobrious title of "the Six;" recollecting always, that they are so called from no peculiar circumstance except their community of tendency. They were in no other way "the Six," than as they were six things that nothing else was like. They were passed in the same year; but they were interlarded with Acts touching Duties on Malt, Sugar, Tobacco, and Snuff in Great Britain, and Pensions, Offices, and Personal Estates in England; on the regulation of Cotton Mills and Factories, and the Preservation of the Health of young Persons employed therein; on the Trial of controverted Elections, or Returns of Members to serve in the United Parliament for Ireland;—making a farrago in which each of the opprobrious "Six" is separated from its fellow, as the pudding draws a veil of separation between the plums,—except in the inevitable cases where the state cook had no farinaceous matter disposable for the division. They were no more meant to be distinguished as "the Six," than six bad eggs are meant to be distinguished by the purchaser. The public that nosed them, gave the title that has stuck by them; and condemned them to everlasting remembrance by the energy of its simplicity.

The first is an Act to prevent the training of persons to the use of arms, and to the practice of military evolutions and exercise;—demonstrating that on the 11th of December 1819, the discontents of Englishmen with the existing government had reached the pitch when men no longer hope for relief but from the exercise of that physical power, which is undoubtedly the basis on which all fragments of public freedom in all coun-

tries are ultimately founded, but which is also the last agent which a good man desires to see a necessity for calling into actual operation. No student of history believes, that in any nation not divided by honest prejudices like those which in a disputed succession or a religious war cause men of equal virtue to engage warmly on different sides, there ever was an instance of a portion of the population having recourse to "the training of persons to the use of arms, and to the practice of military evolutions and exercise," without the fault being originally with the government. A popular frenzy may cause a momentary rush to weapons, but not a scientific civil war, carried on with the best adaptation of means to distant ends within the compass of the performers. The guilt attached to this particular Act, therefore, resided not so much in the Act itself, as in the refusal of attention to just complaints, which had given the occasion for it. It was not till the people of England had contracted an utter despondency and loathing of expectation of relief from the existing government, that such an Act was ever called for; and, keep it with what care they may, it is only when the government shall have created the same feelings a second time, that it ever can be of use again. It is a thing to be laid by and ticketed, "An Act to be used when the government shall have made itself horribly hated by the people." By this Act, however, the drillers in said civil war were made liable to transportation for any term not exceeding seven years, or to imprisonment not exceeding two; and the drilled, to fine, and imprisonment not exceeding two years. Any justice of the peace, or constable or peace-officer, might disperse, arrest, and detain; but why any of these meritorious persons against whom an action should be brought for misconduct in his office and should fail, should be paid his costs *twice* over in that part of Great Britain called England or in Ireland, and *three* times in Scotland, is among those mysteries of the art of government which none but the constructors can explain.

The next is an Act to authorize justices of the peace, in seventeen counties there specified and as many others as might be added in future by proclamation, to seize and detain arms and weapons of various sorts, to wit, pike, pike-head, spear, dirk, dagger, pistol, gun, or other weapon, upon the information upon oath of one or more credible witness or witnesses, that he or they believe that such pike, pike-head, spear, dirk, dagger, pistol, gun, or other weapon is, for any purpose dangerous to the public peace, in the possession of any person, or in any house or place; and in case of admission being refused, to enter by force, by day or night, and to detain or cause

to be detained in safe custody, the pike, pike-head, &c., so found and seized as aforesaid, unless the owner shall prove to the satisfaction of such justice, that such pike, pike-head, &c., was not kept for any purpose dangerous to the public peace. Justices and all manner of persons sued for misconduct but without success, to be paid their costs twice over in that part of Great Britain called England; and only twice in Scotland too, which seems hard. This was the law under which the several counties of Lancaster and Chester, with the West Riding of the county of York, and the counties of Warwick, Stafford, Derby, Leicester, Nottingham, Cumberland, Westmorland, Northumberland, Durham, Renfrew, and Lanark, and the counties of the towns of Newcastle-upon-Tyne and Nottingham, and of the city of Coventry, lay from the 18th day of December 1819 until the 25th day of March One thousand eight hundred and twenty-two. These documents are valuable to the historian, who may wish to know what parts of the country were comprehended in the civil war. Enough has been quoted of the Act to show its bearing and connexions; but in other respects it may pass with the Jacobite epitaph,

> 'Here lies Fred—
> Who was alive, and is dead;
> So there's no more to be said.'

The next is "an Act to prevent Delay in the Administration of Justice in Cases of Misdemeanor." Delay in the administration of justice, is apt to present itself as an evil; and Acts to prevent it, take on themselves a certain outward figure of virtue. But this Act, it will be discovered, was meant only to make the operation of law more severe upon those whom his Majesty's Attorney or Solicitor General delighted to honour. The law as it stood before, was good enough for common men, and might have continued so for ever; but it was not good enough for those impugned of pike, pike-head, spear, dirk, dagger, pistol, gun, or other weapon, and therefore it was altered for their special use and benefit. It might or might not be for the improvement of the law in general, that it should be quickened in its motions on the particular article of misdemeanors; but what impressed itself on the minds of all men, was that the authors recked little of the law's improvement, and saw only the advantage of preventing "the defendants in some of the said "cases" from having "an opportunity of postponing their trials "to a distant period by means of imparlances in the said several "Courts of King's Bench, and by time being given to try in "such respective Courts of Session." For remedy whereof the present Act was enacted, on the 23d day of December 1819, and

continues to us a monument, of that fearfully hard Christmas in legal history, which wound up the 60° Georgii III, and brought in the 1° Georgii IV.

The next is "an Act for more effectually preventing Seditious Meetings and Assemblies;" but which on examination appears to have been for more effectually preventing persons assembling from various parishes and districts, for the purpose of "deliberating upon public grievances, and of agreeing on peti-"tions, complaints, remonstrances, declarations, resolutions, or "addresses upon the subject thereof." The word used in the Act is "pretext;" but as no statement is made of any other design, this is plainly only part of the colouring of an adversary. By this enactment, no more than fifty persons, (except in county meetings to be called by the Lord Lieutenant, the Custos Rotulorum, and the Lord knows who,) were to meet "for the pur-"pose or on the pretext of deliberating upon any public griev-"ance, or upon any matter in church or state, or of considering, "proposing, or agreeing to any petition, complaint, remonstrance, "declaration, resolution, or address upon the subject thereof; "unless in the parish or township within which the persons "calling any such meeting shall usually inhabit or dwell;" nor unless divers formalities of notice to justices of the peace and otherwise, be complied with as there described. That is, fifty thousand may be aggrieved, but only fifty must meet. The law will allow of no deliberation for remedy, except for the grievances of fifties; those of greater numbers are a sacred thing, in virtue of their magnitude. Also such justice may alter time and place of meeting, if he sees any prospect of said justice being benefited thereby, or the persons meeting to deliberate on public grievances annoyed and inconvenienced; but the grievers who are aggrieved by the grievances shall not adjourn or alter time or place of meeting. If they do, it is an illegal assembly; for the meeting is the justice's meeting, and not that of the aggrieved who grieve. Furthermore, no persons to attend meetings, unless freeholders of the county, or members of the corporation, or inhabitants of the city or parish for which the meeting shall be held; all others must be aggrieved in silence, or else grieve in their proper places. Also members of parliament, and any persons having a right to vote for a member to serve in parliament, have a right to grieve in meetings of the city or borough for which they sit or vote; in addition to the right they may have to do so as freeholders or otherwise. Persons grieving out of bounds, to be punished by fine, and imprisonment not exceeding twelve calendar months. Also may be killed, maimed, or hurt, by any justice of the peace, sheriff, undersheriff, mayor, head officer, magistrate, high or petty constable,

or other peace-officer, or by any persons being aiding and assisting to them, by reason of their resisting the persons dispersing, seizing, or apprehending, or endeavouring to disperse, seize, or apprehend them; and all and singular such persons shall be free, discharged, and indemnified, as well against the King's Majesty, his heirs and successors, as against all and every other person and persons, of, for, and concerning the killing, maiming, or hurting of such persons as shall happen to be so killed, maimed, or hurt as aforesaid. Provided also, that nothing herein-before contained shall extend to any meeting wholly holden in any room or apartment of any house or building. Irregular grievers continuing together to the number of twelve or more, by the space of half an hour after proclamation made, shall be adjudged felons, and be liable to be transported for any term not exceeding seven years. Persons attending meetings armed with any gun, pistol, sword, dagger, pike, bludgeon, or other offensive weapon, or with any flag, banner, ensign, device, badge, or emblem, or any drum or military or other music, or in military array or order, to be fined and imprisoned for any term not exceeding two years. Also houses, rooms, fields, or other places, where lectures, discourses, or debates shall be held, to which any person shall be admitted by payment of money, to be deemed disorderly, whether disorderly or not, unless licensed by two or more justices of the peace. Justices and all persons sued for anything done in pursuance of this Act, where the jury shall find a verdict for the defendants, to be paid their costs twice over, as in other places. To continue in force for five years from the day of passing this Act, and until the end of the then next session of Parliament.

Such is the Act with which the miserable men who had paid and suffered for the restoration of despotic monarchs through the greater part of Europe, were repaid by their own rulers on the day before the feast of Christmas in the year of our Lord 1819; a just winding-up of such a course, and one against which it is impossible to find a syllable to object. The Providence was most meet, right, and worthy to be praised, which for the warning of all future generations, attached such a punishment to such an offence. In the better times of English history, the suffering and the contumely would have been cast off by a convulsion similar to those which elsewhere go by the name of glorious revolutions. But whom Providence designs to punish, it can bind. The evil and the suffering are gone by; and Englishmen look back upon the period, as on the times of Jefferies and other noted agents of misrule, with horror not unmingled with satisfaction at the chances of its non-recurrence.

These are the company, some surviving, some deceased, in

which were born the Acts against the press, which are at this moment kept hanging over the heads of Englishmen to remind them that what their fathers were, themselves may be. The first of these monuments of slavery, is called "an Act for the more effectual Prevention and Punishment of blasphemous and seditious Libels." The policy of arbitrary governments has ever been to mix up the idea of the opinions they dread, with something conveying an indistinct notion of horrible and odious. The Inquisition notably pursues this policy, in the associations that amiable institution connects with heresy; and it is not long since a preacher of slavery-defending notoriety* was heard to make the same application to the spirit of political reform. It is probable that very few of the compounders of this Act could have defined what a blasphemous libel meant; but there was an undefined idea that it meant something particularly horrible, which made it all the better for their purpose. Blasphemy, in the primary sense, means a low and vulgar outrage committed in words against some object of allowed religious reverence, for the gratification of malignant feeling or reckless passion excited by causes foreign to religious opinions. The earliest mention of blasphemy in the world, is in the twenty-fourth chapter of Leviticus; where it evidently means the profane cursing of a half-caste camp-follower quarrelling with a private of foot. And as there is nothing inviting or gentlemanlike in this, the term was a convenient one to apply to anything it was wished to overwhelm. And hence came the secondary application of the word; by which it is used for every contradiction, of anything connectible with religion which anybody who is in power chuses to believe,—especially if the contradiction is urged with any degree of vigour, or worse still, of sarcasm. In this sense it is upon record that Jesus of Nazareth was voted a blasphemer; and spit upon and buffeted according to the law for such cases made and provided. The apostles his followers were in like manner blasphemers to a man; and the same charge has been urged with unvarying steadiness, against every one who in his day has done anything unpleasant to any other person who had a religious interest exposed to loss. In this sense there is not a man in England who has not in his day done blasphemy; or if there is, he is at all events one utterly unworthy of good company. But for all this, the word is a good word in an Act of Parliament. A man unpleasing to high-priests may be spit on and buffeted under it, as well as ever. And there it stands, and will stand; to verify the saying of the preacher, that "the

* Irving. The preacher alluded to a particular species of police cases, and declared them to be a consequence of the agitation for political change.—*Author, on republication in* 1839.

thing that hath been, is that which shall be; and there is no new thing under the sun."

Sedition, is defined in the Act to be, anything "tending to "bring into Hatred or Contempt the Person of His Majesty, "His Heirs or Successors, or The Regent, or the Government and "Constitution of the United Kingdom as by Law established, or "either House of Parliament, or to excite His Majesty's Sub-"jects to attempt the Alteration of any Matter in Church or "State as by Law established, otherwise than by lawful means." In this there is a renewal of the attempt to take advantage of men's honest feelings against something avowed on all hands to be bad. The real meaning of "sedition" in this place,—after cutting off all the lumber attached to it,—was evidently all and everything which should be hostile to the power of the framers of the law. It was a sword to be hung by the side of the prevailing party for the time being; and it is kept to be hung by the side of every other party that shall be able to prevail, from henceforth through all futurity.

The first provision of this Act, is for seizing the copies in cases where a verdict shall be had. When a man has printed against you, seize his copies; it is the first law of nature for a government that cannot stand but by hindering men from stating what they think of it. Any person convicted a second time, to suffer such punishment as may be by law inflicted in cases of high misdemeanors, or *to be banished from the United Kingdom, and all other parts of His Majesty's dominions, for such term of years as the court in which such conviction shall take place shall order.* Persons not departing the kingdom within thirty days after sentence, may be conveyed to such parts out of the dominions of the king, as with the advice of the Privy Council may be directed; and if they return, be transported for any term not exceeding fourteen years. The Act was known to be virtually directed against one man*, who in spite of Acts still lives "a prosperous gentleman," and appears more likely than ever, to see of the travail of his soul.

The "crowning mercy" of the knights of the Extinguisher, was the "Act to subject certain Publications to the Duties of Stamps upon Newspapers." The preamble is remarkable. "Whereas Pamphlets and printed Papers containing Obser-"vations upon public Events and Occurrences, tending to excite "Hatred and Contempt of the Government and Constitution of "these Realms as by Law established, and also vilifying our "Holy Religion, have lately been published in great Numbers, "and at very small Prices; and it is expedient that the same "should be restrained: May it therefore please" &c., that

* Mr. Cobbett.

from and after ten days after the passing of this Act, "*all* "Pamphlets and Papers containing *any* Public News, Intelli- "gence or Occurrences, or *any* Remarks or Observations "thereon, or *upon any Matter in Church or State*, printed in "any part of the United Kingdom for Sale, and published "periodically, or in Parts or Numbers, at Intervals not exceed- "ing Twenty-six Days between the Publication of any Two "such Pamphlets or Papers, Parts or Numbers, where any of "the said Pamphlets or Papers, Parts or Numbers respectively, "shall not exceed Two Sheets, or shall be published for Sale "for a less sum than Sixpence, exclusive of the Duty by this "Act imposed thereon, shall be deemed and taken to be News- "papers within the true Intent and Meaning of an Act of Par- "liament &c. and of another Act &c., and of &c. &c., and all "other Acts of Parliament in force relating to Newspapers." In plain English, one Administration in 1797 imposes a stamp-duty on newspapers, because they let in too much light upon the public; and another in 1819 enacts for the same reason, that pamphlets and printed papers shall be newspapers. Next follow divers enactments touching length and breadth of paper, covers and blank leaves, and various other precautions; in which the spirit of Sir Solomon is exhibited as curiously wrestling with the little farthing rush-light that objected to being puffed out. The next is a sweeping clause, subjecting the printers and publishers of *all* Pamphlets of small size and price, whether periodical or not, to a fine of Twenty Pounds for each offence, unless a Bond be previously entered into, to the amount of *three hundred Pounds* in London, and two hundred elsewhere, with two or more sureties in a like sum in the whole, for payment of all fines and penalties that may be imposed for publishing *any blasphemous or seditious libel*. The object of this was plainly twofold; first, to associate cheap publications (which are what the enemies of the community chiefly dread) with "blasphemy and sedition;" and secondly, to impose the necessity of such a bond as the publishers of cheap publications were thought not likely to be able to furnish. The object was to clog the press, and the press is clogged accordingly. The object was to increase the difficulty of disturbing a number of old gentlemen in what they had wrongfully got possession of; and they moved upon their purpose with skill proportioned to their good-will. Divers other provisions follow, all having in view the making it perilous, troublesome, and unprofitable, to have anything to do with circulating cheap knowledge of their interests among the poor. There was something which the poor were not to know; and the best means within reach were accordingly taken, to

keep it from their knowledge. The provisions were in reality so complex, that it is believed to be strict matter of fact, that the entire has never yet in any form or shape been put into execution. And as the knowledge of their impracticability could not be called into existence for the first time the day after the Act was passed, it follows that the impracticability was always known; and that the object of the framers was to demonstrate, that their legislation should not be bounded by the possible, so long as any insult or injury was to be inflicted by enacting the impossible;—that they would put in practice the celebrated injunction* of a noble chancery-suitor to his son, if they were disposed;—that in short all other people were at their mercy, and held what they did hold, only by the difficulty the legislators found in executing their own acts†.

Why a ministry who have certainly not made themselves responsible for the guilt in which these Acts originated, should insist on carrying them about with them as if to claim connexion with the facts,—is almost as unaccountable, as if a man in a clean coat should demand to exchange it for one dabbled in the blood that was shed at Manchester. As it would be considerable evidence of mental derangement if an individual were to insist on walking about with such a patch of unpopular contamination on his person, so the other seems irreducible to the common rules which act upon mankind. There may be a certain desirableness which no minister can positively refuse to notice, in the remote possibility of these old thumb-screws being

---

* The precise words of the injunction were, to "*play hell and Tommy.*" The subject was one that was before the public at the time of writing, in consequence of some law proceedings.—*Added on republication in* 1839.

† If the proprietors of this Review were asked, what impediment *they* have found from any of the Acts in their plans for circulating cheap political knowledge among the people, they would reply, that in the first place, they have never attempted periodical circulation in small periods, or in parts or numbers. At the same time it is not the less true, that this most effectual method of circulating information is cut off, and is cut off because it *is* the most effectual. All that their publisher is actually exposed to for what has been done or is doing, is the penalties for not entering into bond to pay the fines for blasphemous and seditious libels; and when their solicitors were instructed to take measures for the execution of such bond, they made answer, that "they had been to the "Solicitor of Stamps, but he told them, that he never knew an instance of a bond "being given under this Statute in respect of pamphlets; and they should advise "not stirring the matter further." The fact therefore is, that if ever a Jefferies should be Attorney-General, their publisher may be prosecuted for the absence of a bond, which nobody would have a hand in executing. It would be wrong for them to omit saying, that the conduct of the Stamp-office, as far as their own experience has gone, is the reverse of anything vexatious. On the contrary, it applies in favour of the publisher, provisions in the Acts (in respect of blank pages, &c.) which there can be no doubt were intended to operate against him. It is quite clear that the existing government is very much ashamed of the Acts; the more is the pity, that honest gentlemen should be set to execute them in any part.

at some time called again into use; but does the value of this probability pay for the expense of warehouse-room? Is the contingent benefit which is to accrue to nobody can tell who at a period of nobody can tell when, equal to the sum total of the hate, the scorn, the dislike of the existing government, the wish for change, the leaning towards a revolution, the hope that at some time or other something may happen to make one, the discontented looking to all that is, and is not, and might be,—which are from day to day excited, encouraged, and created by the existence of these Acts, in all that portion of the population whom distress or other causes place within the sphere of such an operation? If it is not, why are they kept? Or if they are kept, why is not the Court of Star Chamber, for example, kept in pickle *in terrorem?* Why are visitors not told at the Tower, "These guns and ammunition are kept to fire upon the "people when the king tries to make himself absolute as James "did"? It would be just as easy to make answer, that ministers had no design of using them. The old principle has been, that in a country professing to be free, men were to see provisions made by law for the preservation of the public freedom; not provisions for its destruction, under a verbal engagement not to use them. Why is the community to be insulted by ministers holding over their heads, what they admit to be much too bad to use? Or if the community should give into the principle, that the law is to be made a sink-hole for the storing-up of old abuses, and what the people will allow to be executed is to be the measure of the execution,—is there no danger that the people should go the fraction of a step farther, and say that since they have been trained to be a law unto themselves, they think they can dispense with the written rubbish altogether? There seems to be as little policy in storing-up decayed laws, as rotten apples; unless it is really done in hopes of communicating the taint to the remainder.

Nothing can more usefully conclude this article, than a notice of the poor evasions and miserable wit, with which the removal of these disgraces to the statute-book has been met by the most gifted of their supporters.

'He (Mr. Canning) should like to see any foreigner coming among them, or any man returning after an absence from England often years—he should like to call upon him to state what special grievance he observed to exist in the country. Would he answer, "Why, "nothing now is printed—nothing is said of anybody by the Press—"there is a total stagnation of satirical jokes, of sarcasm and slander. "What has become of the freedom of opinion? Everybody abstains "from animadversions upon private character—everything is sleeping "or dead. The Press is broken up—its occupation's gone; there is

"no such thing now as type and paper." This would be the great grievance pointed out; and to remedy such an oppressive, intolerable evil, the Honourable Member opposite brought forward his Bill [laughter]'.

Observe now what the weakness of that age laughed at. It had been urged that a statute had been directed against the information of the poor, accompanied by many circumstances of insult and violence;—and a man stood up and said, that the press had not been stopped, for there was still printing going on in other places.

'What would be the effect of carrying this measure, and how would its success stop the chasm which the Honourable Proposer lamented? The existing Bill pressed against blasphemous publications comprised in two sheets.'

It pressed against *all* publications comprised in two sheets; as was perfectly within the knowledge of everybody.

'The Honourable Member for Aberdeen said, "Let us have blasphemous publications in two sheets; I hope you will repeal the Bill that prevents our having blasphemous libels in two sheets" [laughter].

The application was for the removal of the Act which had been directed against *all* publications in two sheets, on the pretence that there were blasphemous libels that were on the same quantity of paper.

'To this he (Mr. Canning) replied, that the blasphemy, to be brought under the Act, must not only be comprised within such a specific compass, but the author must value the produce of his brains under sixpence. These were the three essential qualities required to bring a publication within the meaning of the Act—namely, blasphemy the size of two sheets, and the value of less than sixpence. These were the three objects which the Act intended to repress, and by which the Honourable Member was of opinion that the general liberty of the Press was extinguished. To be sure, blasphemy was of a most volatile, changeable essence; but if any man wished to lay his hand upon the hallowed work that restrained it, and was desirous to restore the freedom of the press, the object was not difficult to attain. Let the Gentleman who had so much blasphemy on hand, tack an additional sheet to the proscribed number of two, let him come out on the 28th instead of the 26th day, and let him screw his courage to the sticking-place, and charge sixpence-halfpenny for his productions, and he avoided the law.'—*Morning Chronicle, June* 1, 1827. *Speech of Mr. Canning, May* 31.

All this mummery is meant to conceal the fact, that the publications of the poor man have been prohibited on the pretence of blasphemy. It is needless to insist further on the flagrant untruth of the ministerial assertion, that blasphemy was one of the qualities required to bring a publication within the

meaning of the Act. The speaker knew as well as the present reader does, that the Act specified *all* publications containing *any remarks on public occurrences*, of certain size and form. It is Nero fiddling, while the matches are laying under the thing it is his intention to destroy.

The object aimed at by the present article, is to attract the attention of that part of the public which it may reach, to the promised discussion of the subject by the legislature, and to the arguments by which the removal of the matter of complaint will be supported or opposed. If it has this effect, the benefit of the result will be independent of the merits of the execution*.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW. 1 April, 1830.

ART. XVII.—*Le Représentant des Peuples. Hebdomadaire de la Politique et de la Littérature étrangères. No.* I.—pp. 36. Ridgway.

IT is not easy to translate the title of this weekly publication into English with conciseness and effect. It is not "The Representative of the people;" for that would be understood as applying to the people of some particular country, or else to the people in all countries, considered in the light in which they may be assumed to form a single aggregate. And to say "The Representative of the *peoples*" would not be understood at all. Such, however, is the idiom of the original; and the unlearned Englishman will have no difficulty in comprehending on being told, that it means the Representative of each of the several "peoples" of the civilized world, considered as forming distinct and several aggregates, as they really do in point of fact.

Unlearned Englishmen are at this moment enduring so much suffering, for the folly of their predecessors in allowing themselves to be made a cat's paw for imposing arbitrary government on foreigners, that they ought to receive with great gratitude any foreigner, who will endeavour to extend the knowledge of the interests which are in common to the people of all countries, and which can never be injured in one without bringing a corresponding harvest of mischief on the others. Let the unlearned Englishman, for example, attend to the struggle which is at this moment carrying on between the people and arbitrary power in France. Let him view a monarch, imposed

* Everything remains as it was, to this day; except the reduction of the stamp on Newspapers, in which the Penny Stamp, which is what keeps them out of the hands of the numerous classes, was carefully preserved.—*Added on republication in* 1839.

upon the nation in the same manner as would have happened if the Pretender had been brought to London by a victorious French army;—let him see him unceasingly persisting in all plans for restoring the power of the supporters of ancient abuses, and insisting as a preliminary, on the appointment of a ministry composed of men who have been educated in inveterate hostility to the French people, and of deserters from their army,—and above all, let him view the tone and spirit in which the contest is looked on by the friends of arbitrary power at home,—their longing hope for the success of the despotism, their insulting language to all that stand up for the people's right, their confident trust that a "monarch" will not be stopped by a majority of a "chamber of deputies," which being translated, means a House of Commons;—and then let him consider whether he will be duped like his predecessors, into a belief that this is no business of his own, and that it is all one to him whether arbitrary power on the other side of eight leagues of water is successful or defeated. The case of France is here taken, as being the nearest and of most magnitude. But to every other struggle for political freedom the same inference is applicable. The English artizan, the labourer, the husbandman, is wretched because his father was gulled into the enormous insanity, of hazzaing for the slavery of countries on the other side the sea; and the best way in which the spread of knowledge can have exerted itself, will be if it has taught him, that the interest of freedom any-where, is the interest of free men every-where,—that political liberty is like water, a thing not to be gathered up in heaps, but only to be raised in a particular place by raising it through all the level of the rest. If through the tricks of the English absolutists, a free constitution is broken up, for instance, in Portugal,—they laugh, because they know it has a final bearing on some possible infliction on present or future Englishmen. The opportunity may not be actually cut and dried; it may be among things yet unborn, and the men may be yet unborn who are to make use of it. But, first or last, it is an addition to the grand family estate of English absolutism. It is a feather in the cap of the brotherhood of absolutists throughout the world. Every man of them has a fillip from it, and conveys the adventitious vigour to his posterity. And by the same token, every blow given to the attempts of arbitrary power,—even though on so remote and insulated a point of the field of action as Terceira,—makes a Jacobite of the nineteenth century "rise with a crick in his neck" for at least the next week, and pulls down something of the triumph with which the giant would otherwise proceed upon his course. The people of England have still

a hankering after freedom everywhere. They have been bought up, but not all. Their country is the head-quarters, the citadel, the hope and trust, of despotism throughout the world; but there are dissentients in the camp, men base enough to wish and sigh for the success of liberty abroad, for the sake of the small reversion that may ultimately follow to themselves. Foreigners are wrong if they despise individual Englishmen, on account of the numberless acts of sly and fraudulent hostility to freedom, which mark the proceedings of their nation. They are not free agents. Wherever the feelings of an individual, not acting under the impulse of power, can be displayed, they are, three times out of four, in favour of the principles of universal justice. But this individual lives under a government that is fearfully and wonderfully made, for the purpose of securing the direction of all public acts by the will of a minority. There is a private John Bull, and a public John Bull; and it would be a burning shame to condemn the first for the offences of the other. If the "Representative" ever makes communications to his constituents in return, let him tell them this. Let him assure them that an abstract Englishman ought not to be tossed in a blanket in Portugal, for having inveigled honest men into the dungeons of a tyrant, nor spit upon in Mexico for cutting the sinews of her defence under the guise of a neutrality. These are all acts which the mass of English "had nothing to do with but to obey." A Briton blusters, and calls himself free, when he is among foreigners with whom he thinks he may take liberties without fear of being found out; but it would be very hard to make him personally amenable to the consequences of his rhodomontade. It is not *his* interest that is concerned, in giving sneaking assistance to arbitrary sovereigns in all quarters of the globe; nor is it *his* fault, if the security of slavery in the colonies, made it necessary to give foul play to the Mexicans, by pinioning the arms of one combatant and letting loose the other. The existence of colonial slavery is to himself a bitter draught. He pays for it daily and hourly; it is in his path and about his bed; in his wife's tea-cup, and at the bottom of his children's apple-pie; and it would be hard that after being made to pay for the primary evil, he should be individually responsible for the consequence.

The Prospectus (which by itself makes a pamphlet of eight pages) begins by stating the unanimity with which, for the last fifteen years, the inhabitants of all the civilized countries of the continent have moved in pursuit of improvement in their government, and the exertions by which what are called "sound monarchical doctrines" have been pushed forward in

opposition to their demands. On which ensues the following very descriptive passage.

* 'En vertu de ces doctrines, les rois seuls ont des droits ; la loi, c'est le bon plaisir; le peuple n'a que des devoirs: obéir et payer, sans murmures et sans plainte, ou passer par les armes, voilà la destinée à laquelle ses dominateurs le condamnent; *et ces faux dieux disent "tout est bien!" et ils le font proclamer par leurs agents, dans l'intérieur, au milieu du silence général! et ils le font répéter par leurs ambassadeurs, aux gouvernements étrangers, et souvent leur or prodigué à la vénalité, crée au milieu des peuples étrangers des échos de l'imposture! et les opprimés sont abandonnés à leur malheur, comme indignes de la liberté, parce qu'on les représente comme patients, satisfaits même sous la tyrannie!*'

'*Ce tableau est d'une vérité incontestable. N'est-ce pas ce que nous entendons dire chaque jour du Portugal, de l'Espagne, de l'Italie et d'autres pays encore?* les peuples de ces contrées n'ayant d'organes, ni chez eux, ni chez les étrangers, ne peuvent rectifier les erreurs involontaires et les jugements hasardés, ni démentir les calomnies intéressées de leurs ennemis, et sont condamnés, sur des écrits erronés d'observateurs superficiels, ou sur les mensonges diplomatiques de leurs oppresseurs.'

Under such circumstances it is manifestly a high honour, that England should hold out those faculties of communication and reciprocal information, which her happier situation enables her to extend; and should perform that office to the civilized world, which Holland, Switzerland, and the early American settlements, have on different occasions discharged in her own case, in her periods of darkness and discomfiture.

In consequence of the near coincidence of the times of publication (the first appearance of the "*Représentant*" being announced for the 27th of March) the specimen which has been obtained of the first Number has been disjointed and

---

* 'In virtue of these doctrines, kings are the only persons who have any rights; the law, is their good pleasure; the people, have nothing but duties; to obey and pay their money, without either murmurs or complaint, or else be put to the sword,—this makes the lot their rulers condemn them to. *And all the while, these sham gods say "All's Well"; and they get their agents to cry out so in the interior of their countries, amidst the silence of everybody else; and they have it repeated by their ambassadors to foreign governments, and often contrive to get up an echo of the imposture in foreign countries, by the gold they throw to such as are ready to sell themselves; and the sufferers are left to their misfortune, as undeserving freedom, because they are represented as patient, and even satisfied under the tyranny.*'

'*No man can say this picture is not true. Is not it what we hear said every day, of Portugal, Spain, Italy, and more places besides?* The people of these countries having no means of making themselves heard either at home or abroad, have no chance of either rectifying unintentional mistakes and hasty opinions, or of giving the lie to the interested calumnies of their enemies; and are condemned on the blundering accounts of superficial observers, or the diplomatic falsehoods of their oppressors.'

imperfect, and such as to make it very possible that alterations in arrangement or in matter may take place, at a period, in French intelligence particularly, so fertile in events and expectations. But with the reservation of such alterations, the contents are nearly as follows.

The first article is a Letter on the project for raising the Prince of Saxe Cobourg to the throne of Greece; which, whether it is to be considered as authentic or a *jeu d'esprit* of the author, says what *ought* to be said upon that subject, with much point and effectiveness. A translation is subjoined of the whole*; and it seems needless to give the original of what

---

'Cephalonia, 20 Feb. 1830.'

* 'It appears that the fate of our country is at last decided. Agreeably to the principles of modern politics, everybody has been consulted on this decision, except those who are most interested in it, namely we poor Greeks. One remark naturally occurs to all minds, and disgusts them all. It is, that ever since the commencement of our struggle, in the days of our greatest dangers and bitterest sufferings, for the seven wretched years that we were fighting, with alternations which often threw doubt on the final issue of our insurrection, and when an enlightened and generous interference would have stopped the effusion of blood, and hastened, without the possibility of anything preventing it, our re-appearance as a nation on the scene of politics,—all the governments either were in favour of our oppressors, or if they remained neuter, were not the less decided in expressing their disapprobation of our attempt. It was only when the continuation of the war had shown our determination to triumph or to perish, and when the chances of success were found to be in our favour, that the governments condescended at last to take some notice of us, and changed from indifference that had the effects of hostility, to neutrality, and from neutrality to interference. From that instant it was clear that they were looking for an excuse to call themselves our deliverers, in order to impose on us another kind of bondage; and I foresaw the winding-up with which we are threatened at this moment.'

'This winding-up, is the formation into a monarchy, of the countries which composed the ancient republics of Greece. Is the monarchical system suited to the different people of these countries? They are told, without further inquiry, that it *must* suit them whether they *will* or no.'

'What are to be the forms of this monarchy? What are to be the limits of the power of the king? What are to be the constitutional rules for his government? What part, in short, are the people to have in the settling of their own affairs? Nobody can tell a word. The masters of our fate appear to have seen no use in troubling themselves with these matters of theory, which they think, besides, are in opposition to the real principles of monarchical government. They appear to have believed the system was complete in these words, "The Greeks shall have a king!"

'To be of a piece, the same sound sense and good discretion were to be displayed in the selection of the king. It is well known that when a crown is to be given away, there is no want of persons to consent to take it. There might have been some found in Greece itself, in spite of the republican feelings of its inhabitants. But to have taken a Greek, would have looked like acknowledging a right of the people. It would have had the appearance of declaring, that a king ought to belong to the country that he governs. In short it would have been possible, by bare chance, to have fallen on such a thing as a patriot king. To avoid these three risks, it has been decided that the king of the Greeks was not to be a Greek.'

'As Germany is the only place left, where true theories of the feudal system are taught in combination with sound doctrines on the monarchical principle, it is to Germany that the hunters for stuff to make kings of, have turned their eyes; and to complete the business, it is the Prince of Saxe Cobourg

*

can so easily be referred to. Could no form of government be found, better than a monarchy? Or was the object to provide a point of *appui* for the spirit of change, whenever the time comes for the breaking-up of the great frost in which the continent has been bound so long?

---

who, according to report, has got the suffrages of the august electors on his side.'

'When this name comes to be proclaimed in Greece, it will be the first time it was ever heard of there. I am aware, that under average circumstances, there might be something lucky in the accession of a prince, of whom nobody had ever said a word; but under the particular circumstances of the present case, this does not seem to hold quite good. Perhaps it would have been as well, that the name announced should not have been entirely unknown to all the population. Not that there was any necessity for its being one distinguished for splendour of talents or military glory; all that, is not required to make a good king, and very often makes a very bad one. It would have been enough, if it had been one that had been heard sometimes in connexion with the names of the earliest, the most unwearied, and most generous friends of Greece. But I am falling into the mistake of assuming, that to be a king, there ought to be some affection for those who are to be the subjects. The monarchy-makers of our times consider this as an absurdity in theory, and give good proof of it in their practice.'

'However this may be, my countrymen and myself are unable to account for the preference that has been given to Prince Leopold. It surely is not meant as a compliment due to his birth. We do not deny that the Prince of Saxe Cobourg is a younger son of very good family; but we may be allowed to say, that we have still left among ourselves some eldest sons of houses as good as his, and that there would have been no great difficulty in finding an individual in Europe, who upon this head, as upon many others, would have had more title to the respect of the leaders of the Greeks.'

'If to all this is added the difference of ideas, of language, and of religion, mankind might be tempted to suppose that the authors of this project had intended to proclaim to the world, that a king ought to have nothing in common with his people; if not to try how far it was possible to push the opposition between them, on all imaginable points.'

'One thing I am very sure of,—that the trial is a dangerous one, and the makers had best take care of the consequences. The natural sequence of things, under such a settlement, will be as follows;—Distrust, disunion, misunderstanding, impediments to the public service, public business badly carried on, discontent, severities, resistance, fighting, destruction of the machine of government, and so on. And instead of attributing these wretched consequences to their true causes, namely the ignorance, the hatred of liberal principles amounting to idiocy, of five or six bad ministers,—the cry will be loudly set up that the Greeks are a race without knowledge, without gratitude, enemies of all order, unworthy of freedom, and the yoke of the Turks is the only government that they are fit for.'

'I hope it may not yet be too late for wholesome consideration, on the part of at least one government. If this hope fails, I beg the prince who is to have the crown of Greece, to consult some persons acquainted with the country. Their advice will lead him, I am sure, to prefer the tranquillity and advantages of his present rank, to the perilous honour of going to sit down on a throne which he will find fall to pieces under him in a few years, or else he will be forced to abandon, in spite of all his protectors can do to hinder it.'

'There was one very natural and simple way of providing the Greeks with the machinery for being a nation, and promoting the establishment of a government suitable to the habits, wants, and interests of the country. It required only a little less hatred for political freedom, a little more affection for mankind, and a moderate dose of common sense. I shall describe this method in my next letter, unless the execution of the project which we all set ourselves against to the utmost, condemns me to silence and waiting patiently for better days.'

The second article is on the present state of the Netherlands, and contains one remarkable intimation, supported by tokens of considerable authority, on certain projects of a deceased statesman for whom freedom wears no mourning, having reference to those countries. What a droll thing it would be thought, if there was a chance for the whole constitution, interests and political connexions of the United States of America, being found some morning changed, by virtue of the loves or hates of Miss or Master Maddison if such there be, and if the business of the leader of the administration was to play his cards, as hearts or clubs were trumps in such a game!

The third is upon Portugal; a fertile subject, since ministers have undertaken to boast of the unanimity with which despotism is accepted in that country,—knowing all the time, that 100,000 men were marched on the Peninsula to put down the friends of constitutional freedom, and that these friends would be great fools if they exposed themselves to danger, till the 100,000 men are ready to march the other way. If England had been occupied by the brother kings of James the Second, it would have been about as reasonable to harangue on the *unanimity* with which arbitrary power had been accepted in the Isle of Wight. Wait till there is some fair play; and then it will be seen who are inclined for liberty, and who are not.

The next article is on Mexico; which appears likely to undergo a second invasion from Cuba, because the interests of British slavery made it imperiously necessary for England to prevent the Mexicans from attacking Cuba when they might. If ever the chance returns, the Mexicans will probably be aware, that there is considerable difference between the ease and comfort of committing a breach of neutrality the first time, and the second. It is probable, that after what has been said in Parliament upon *the first*, the Mexicans would effect an insurance upon Change at a low rate, on the non-occurrence of the other.

The last article is on France, and contains reflections and documents on the various events immediately connected with the present crisis. To those who love a jest in the midst of perils, may be recommended the *mezzo termine* proposed to the majesty of France, as an escape from the dilemma between mounting *à cheval* and *en charrette*, which appears to have pressed unpleasantly upon the royal imagination.

The most serious objection that can be urged against the article on France, is to the assumption that France is attached

to monarchy. Opinions on this side the water lean to the conclusion, that in all the civilized portion of the European continent, the thing called monarchy is tolerated only upon a calculation of the probable cost of alteration. The experiment of what has been termed constitutional government, has been tried and failed. The legitimates refused this, while they might have had it; and the probability is, that they will have something they like less. Why the opinion and choice of one individual in a country, and that probably the worst educated within its bounds, should be set against the opinion and choice of millions;—why Europe should be filled with blood and discord, and the best men of half the continent be wandering in sheep-skins and in goat-skins as too good for their day and generation;—are questions so utterly insoluble on any ground of common reason or general expediency,—that it is impossible rational creatures should not bethink themselves of asking what all this is for, and of casting their eyes in search of models, upon the great fabric of public happiness which the descendants of Englishmen have raised on the other side of the Atlantic. Let it be settled, that there will be no more revolutions for constitutional monarchy upon the continent. The fight will be of another kind; and Englishmen have had too much experience of the past, to doubt to which side they ought to wish the victory.

Programme to the Westminster Review for 1 July, 1830.

IN publishing the present number of their work, the conductors see themselves surrounded only by omens of success. The patriarch of modern criticism has just commenced a second century of the brief term that makes the critic's year; and the Westminster Review,—so swift is the lapse of time,—is already entering on the manhood of vigorous twenty-five. If it has maintained its ground against such powerful competition, it owes it to its independence of all parties, except the party of the people, and its freedom from all influences, by which it might be attracted from its just pursuit.

It has existed long enough, to see the cause in which its efforts were begun, make a notable advance in the opinions of mankind. Its proposed object was to prove, that the interests which were supposed confined to the wretched and the weak, are in reality those of all ranks and orders in the state; and if the course has been successfully shaped, it is unnecessary to discuss what portion of the progress has been consequent on the efforts of the rowers, and what on the general tide which car-

ried them upon their way. The term Radical once employed as a name of low reproach, has found its way into high places, and is gone forth as the title of a class, who glory in their designation, and are not afraid to speak with their enemies in the gate. Like the early Christians, they may say to their opponents,—* *Hesterni sumus, et vestra omnia implevimus, urbes, insulas, castella, municipia, conciliabula, castra ipsa, tribus, decurias, palatium, senatum, forum.* They cannot even add the †*Sola vobis relinquimus templa.* What has been gained by reason, will never be wittingly abused; and it will be fame enough for common men, if what they have hitherto defended, they hereafter can assist.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 July, 1830.

Art. XIV.—1. *'Good Friday; or the Murder of Jesus Christ by the Jews.* —By William Cobbett. Published by the Author, 183, Fleet Street. 1830.

2. *Cobbett's Weekly Political Register.*—London; Saturday, June 5th, 1830.

3. *Two Letters, in answer to the Objections urged against Mr. Grant's Bill for the Relief of the Jews: with an Appendix.*—London. W. J. Ruffy. 1830.

LES blancs l'ont tué; tuez tous les blancs!‡ —Such is said to have been the exhortation of a negro chief in St. Domingo to his followers, while pointing to the crucifix.

The Good Friday sermon against the Jews appears to have been written for the purpose of neutralizing any inference that might be drawn from the above, touching the relative capacities of the African and European races. The exhortation of the negro might have been considered as decisive, if a white man could not have been produced to match it. But when allowance is made for the difference of opportunities, of provocation, and of circumstances, it is impossible to deny that as far as the evidence has yet gone, the balance is in favour of the Africans; and something must be produced against them, much more absurd, unreasonable, and senseless than has yet appeared, before it can be averred to be brought to an equality.

The author of the sermon loves not Jews. Nobody wants him to love them; but as a Christian, he should be forgiving. "They have pelted me," says he, "many a time with snow-balls,

* 'We are but a sect of yesterday, and you have no place that is not full of us. We are in your cities, colonies, garrisons, corporations, your very camps, your wards, your guilds, your palace, senate, bar.'

† 'Your temples are the only places we leave you to yourselves.'—*Tertulliani Apologeticus*, c. 37.

‡ 'The white men killed him; kill all the whites!'

" or rotten apples, or clods of dirt *." No, there is a mistake; the youthful patriot pelted *them.* They invaded not his bacon, nor trampled upon his turnips; but the juvenile philosopher knew by their beards that they deserved punishment at his hands, and the spirit that fell on him told him he was to be the avenger of his country. What in his tender years he commenced with mud, in his ripe age he consummates in a sermon; and stands forth gloriously in both, a judge in Israel from his youth up, a man devoted from his swaddling-clothes to be a shepherd and a leader of the people.

Now hear the reasons. Certain Jews in the time of Tib[illegible] committed a murder. That is, the chief priests and leaders of the synagogues,—energetic men in all ages,—raised an outcry against an innocent individual for being better than themselves; and by dint of setting on an orthodox, church-and-king mob persuaded a rather soft Roman governor to allow them to put him to death. And the mob yelled, as a high-church mob would yell tomorrow, if the author of the Register or anybody else were the victim. But supposing a mob did this, and the author of the Register was the sufferer,—will he set it down in print, that the descendants of Englishmen at large ought to be pelted by little boys from henceforth for ever? Can he prove that there would be common sense, or vulgar two-penny reason, in thus heaping up the punishment of the guilty upon those who could have no control over the fact? How does he know, but he is himself a lineal descendant of some that made holocausts in Smithfield? and if so, what pity there is nobody to pelt the portion of his ancestors that is in him, to scrutinize with pebbles the seat of their original sin, and do justice on the peccant part that has descended to their posterity. How strange would have been the contortions, how violent the reprobation, if it had been proceeded to execute such justice at Botley or Barn Elms; and yet why not, as well as the youthful Porcupine assault passengers on the high road for sins committed under the Roman Empire, or the grown one write sermons to call down on them the hatred of their countrymen?

Secondly, they take usury; that is to say, they let out their money for hire, to those who think it worth while to take it in. And why not money, as well as a newspaper? Is there anything more degrading in a man's letting out the use of his money for payment, than in writing a newspaper for payment? Where is the proof, that one way of deriving advantage from a man's industry is discreditable, and the other is not? It

* Weekly Political Register, June 5th, 1830.

must be highly consolatory to those who have reason for apprehension from some parts of the author's political course, to see that he is still groping among such beggarly elements, as trying to raise an outcry against men's not giving the use of their property for nothing. Does the author of the Register give his Register for nothing? Will he *lend* a good half of his flourishing plantation-ground, *hoping for nothing thereby?* And if not, why should not there be a law to pelt him, and a special act to prevent him from sitting in the House of Commons?

When a European vessel is wrecked on the coast of Barbary, the survivors are divided among the captors, and immediately engaged in such servile offices as they are fit for. On one occasion an unhappy man of letters was found to have been employed in sitting on eggs to hatch them. If the author of the sermon on Good Friday were made to hatch eggs by a Mussulman, he would learn how bitter and absurd a thing religious persecution seems when the suffering is reversed. How speedily would better views introduce themselves into his mind, how rapidly would his prejudices be mollified, his hatred ooze away, and his unlovely passions sink into repose, if he were introduced for one three-weeks (or four, if the eggs were duck's) into this downy seat of meditation and remorse. Marius on the ruins of Carthage, would hardly be a more striking subject for a painter, or a more useful for a moralist.

Think only of the author of a newspaper at the present time of day, canting like a bishop, about "a neighbouring nation "plunged into all the terrors of anarchy," and quoting St. Gregory to prove taking interest to be "*felony* and *parricide*." What can have led any sensible man to mount on a dead horse like this? The appeal might once have been dangerous; but he must have sadly miscalculated if he did not know, that all possibility of blowing up a spark of danger on such grounds, had long since gone out.

Tertio, that the Kentucky men, a great authority, have driven six Jews from Louisville, by virtue of the intuitive faculty by which a Kentucky man sees into the deficiencies of the laws. Remains to be known, whether this proves anything but that the Kentucky men were in their debt. For be it noted, there is not the slightest pretence of proving that they amassed property by unlawful methods, or by methods which were not just as open to every Christian Kentucky-man as to themselves. But their sin was, that they amassed property; and the sin of the Jews in Europe is the same. Petitions upon petitions come forward, declaring that they are as true and just in their dealings as any other order of citizens. But they amass property, and therefore the author of the sermon on Good Friday cannot

abide them. To balance the story from Kentucky, it should at least have been stated that the West-Indian legislatures not generally supposed to labour under any mania of libe any strong degree of blindness to their own immediate were at the same moment removing disabilities from the Jews. The conclusion is simple; in the West Indies it is the custom for men to pay their debts, in Kentucky not.

Lastly, it appears that when the author of the *Regi* "a very little boy," "the house of a Mrs. Hutchins, a widow, "who occupied a farm and gardens at Chelsea," was broken open by Jews, who went to the house in the night, forced the door open by means of a screw or jack (a thing beyond the genius of Christian diplomacy), and robbed the house of every thing valuable, and murdered the servant man with circumstances of great barbarity. Whereupon the author is surprised, that Mr. Hutchins of Chelsea, who is believed to be the son of the Mrs. Hutchins above mentioned, does not petition the House of Commons against the Jews. For which the best reason that can apparently be given, is that Mr. Hutchins is not disposed to prove himself such a simpleton.

Nevertheless, the author of the sermon does not call upon Christians "to destroy them;"—*how charitable!* He does not exhort them "to hunt them from the land like beasts of "prey;"—*how considerate!* He only wishes that Christians would not be so blasphemous as to allow them an equality of laws. He does not call out for burning them, for burning days are gone; but he sees a certain chance of struggling to inflict on them some minor kind of martyrdom, and he preaches at it with the vigour of a Capuchin and the keenness of the Holy Office. And after all, what authority have Christians for inflicting legal disabilities on Jews, on account of anything they or their forefathers may have done? The sufferer on whose account all this violence is pretended to be got up, died exclaiming "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do!"—"Never forgive them," says the author of the sermon, "for they knew very well what they did; and their posterity knew too."

So far for the question of moral propriety; next, for that of theological. Christians believe that an individual in human form in the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius, gave evidence by miraculous performances of his being sent of God. Large masses of mankind, both in the countries where the performances are stated to have taken place and in others,—at the time stated for the performance, and all subsequent periods,—have agreed in the belief that the statement is correct in all its parts, and vast superstructures of temporal and spiritual power

have been raised thereupon. In the midst of this is found a sect of men, who say (and nobody denies it) that they are the lineal descendants of the inhabitants of those countries, and though it is certain that numbers of their countrymen at the time gave in their adhesion to the reality of the facts in question, *they* are the descendants of the portion that did not. They raise no doubt on the fact, that an individual who declared himself, or was declared by others, to be in some manner the King of the Jews, and who added thereto, by the avowal of his own followers, a system of energetic attack on the established hierarchy of the country,—was (as has happened to a majority of reformers in every age, and as would be exceedingly likely to happen in many places in the present age) put to a violent death by the influence of those who had strong interest in putting down his alterations or reforms. They have no motive for denying, that he was put to death under circumstances of the highest suffering and contumely that could be applied by the execution or perversion of the existing law; and they make no show of maintaining, that the mode of execution was not barbarous, ferocious, and disgraceful, in as high degree as in the case of any other laws of barbarous ages. But, setting all this on one side, they appear here as the representatives of those who were upon the spot and *did not* see cause for coming to the same conclusions as the Christians. And hereupon bursts out a demand, to pelt them, to treat them as "inanimate substances," to "rise upon them as a body, and drive "them out of the territory." Though they creep into holes and corners with their religion, they are "insolent ruffians, who "mock at the religion and morality of Christians." To the truth now,—there is nothing like the truth,—*did ever any man, woman, or child, hear a Jew mock?* Let proclamation be made at St. Paul's, let a reward be offered for any living creature that will come forward and prove, that he ever heard a Jew mock; and let it be settled once for all, whether this is truth or calumny. Their ceremonies, though avowed by Christians to have been instituted by the immediate command of God, are declared by the same man that professes an outrageous Christianity, to be such as it is "infamy to call religious." They are moreover "filthy;"—they wear a wrong coat, or they stink. All the persecuted stink. One of the first receipts for having a man persecuted, is to impugn the credit of his corporal presence. But what does it all come to, but that there is a certain caste of believers among the Christians, who wish the Jews were at the devil? What inference would be drawn from the fact, if the case were reversed,—and if it was the Chris-

tians that were to be put out of the pale of society, because they gave evidence of a belief hostile to the tenets of the Jews? Ages ago, (and the sermon would have been in its right place, if it had been found in a mummy-case,) such policy might have been of use. But who will look abroad into the world as it stands at the present moment, and view all they see there with reference only to its existence, and not to whether they are pleased with its existence or the contrary,—and then say there is any policy just now, in getting up a hubbub for the suppression of men of an opposite belief?

And this leads to the broad statement of the proposition,—That men do not form civil societies, for the maintenance of *any* form of religious opinions, but for purposes common to all and antecedent to all;—and that consequently all attempts to found any civil superiority or inferiority upon religious belief, are simply attempts to defraud and rob; and are to be resisted, like other attempts at fraud and robbery, by the good sense of the community informing them, that the injury is not done to the sufferer only, but to the whole. Why is not X. Y. Z. knocked down and robbed at Charing Cross,—when it is palpable upon inspection,—when it is clear beyond all possibility of helping it by demonstration,—that no other human being can by any the remotest possibility, henceforth or at any imaginable period, be X. Y. Z.? Is it clearer or so clear, that the member for the University of Oxford will never be a Jew? Or is it practicable to imagine a more perfect exemption from all chance of being made to exchange personalities with the sufferer? Why then does the sovereign people, in the exercise of its popular good will and pleasure, determine that X. Y. Z. shall not be knocked down and robbed at Charing Cross,—even though to wearing an unfashionable garment, he should add the crime of selling oranges, and be strongly suspected of having lost a joint of his little finger, though he keeps it carefully invested in his small clothes? Why, in the name of common sense, but because every lout—that is not a thief,—every way-faring man—that is not a picker up of unconsidered trifles by nature and by practice,—knows that if X. Y. Z. comes to any harm, there is not a combination of letters in the alphabet that is not likely to have its turn. Equality upon such points, is the first principle of popular justice. It is "*ne QUIS fur*," without any exception in favour of religious creeds; and if the people's betters do not think so too, it is only because their betters are under circumstances of peculiar difficulty and temptation, which the people should make allowances for, when the question is of allowing them to have their own way. But as long as there is

any disposition to thrust forward some particular set of individuals, as those who may properly be cut off from common right,—as long as there has not been obtained a full, total, and all-comprehensive assurance, that no case of exception, on any pretence or for any reason, does or can exist,—just so long is every man, who has the sense to see a danger before it strikes against his nose, bound to make common cause with the forlorn hope of the persecuted, whoever they may be. If it is safe to doubt the divine procession of bishops,—if a man who hesitates upon that point can lie quietly in bed without being roused by a dragoon,—it is only because a certain progress has been made in declaring that religious opinion in general shall be free; and in exact proportion to that progress, is the safety of the slumbering misbeliever in the lower degree. If he is safe at all, it is only because somebody has gone and bivouacked beyond him. It matters not what difference of garb, or food, or faith, may separate the clans that meet for the settling of the great contest. It matters not how little one ally may love another *quoad* his own private use and edification. But there is a great fight to fight; and the man must be a fool or an idiot, who will quarrel with the cut of his neighbour's beard, when the question is whether men's thoughts shall be safe, or whether society shall be one great border fray, where *he* shall eat whom strength and a long sword enable to cater for himself. A government that has been foolish enough to decline doing justice to a portion of its subjects *because they were few*, must be shown that the interested are *not few*. It is not the question of the twenty-seven thousand, but of the fourteen millions, and in a less especial manner of the whole twenty-two millions besides. A compact must be made against such a principle, like what exists against other forms of evil; and if John Nokes is injured, proceedings must lie, not in the name of John Nokes, but of the commonwealth.

But what is to be done with a writer, who condescends to stir popular prejudice against vaccination because it is *beastly*. Roast beef is beastly; the only excuse for eating it, is that it is salutary or pleasant. To escape dying of the small-pox, is salutary; to escape being made a fright of, is pleasant;—why then is one use of cow's flesh less dignified than the other? But the instance is invaluable, as a specimen of reasoning. There is no use in quarrelling with it; the wisdom of our ancestors must have its advocates, as well as everything else. But could not the author of the sermon have introduced a word for witches? He must have known of many, among the old women in his neighbourhood. A quotation from Hebrew writ might have been found to bear upon the point, with quite as much of

application as the passage selected for his text. Judge Hale too, the witch-finder, would have been exceedingly *à propos* to the previous subject. The community of old women have cause of quarrel with the author, for neglecting so favourable an opportunity of serving the interests of his clients.

On the whole, the best way of expressing an opinion of the discreditable performance thus in mockery edited in the form of a sermon, will be by recommending the friends of religious freedom, and those most interested in the present question in particular, to circulate it in all directions; and if it encourages the author to sermonize again, it will be so much the better for the general cause. The minister whose melancholy duty it is to act as a drag-chain upon the progress of liberal ideas, and fight the dreary battles of a decayed and decaying cause, wanted only the misfortune of such a coalition. How strong must be the power of ambition, how delightful its gratification, which can carry men through so many exertions from which ordinary minds turn with apprehension or disgust.

It is agreeable to pass over to the other side of the case. When men are to be persecuted, it is desirable that they should be feeble, that they should be unable to speak for themselves, that they should have no means of calling on others for assistance,—that they should be, in short, as nearly as possible in the situation of those whom the author of the Register declares himself to have been in the habit of selecting to pelt. And by parity of reasoning, it is undesirable that they should be rich and well-informed, and as able as other people to ask why the pelters should not be put into the stocks. It is very difficult to maintain the persecution of men who can write for themselves as ably as the author of the "Letters." It would be much safer attacking the little withered old gentleman from Aleppo, who brushes his rhubarb with his beard in the neighbourhood of the Mansion-House. And yet this little old gentleman has the spirit of a gentleman; for it is but a few days since he was spoken to in his native language, and when money was given him as a compensation for detaining him, he drew from his box a modicum of purgation, and put it into the speaker's hand with Oriental grace, saying "*Karrim*," which being interpreted is "Do me the favour," as being unwilling to be outdone in an expression of good will. Why should the poor old man be pelted by the author of the Register? Or if it is to be so merely because the author of the Register does not like him,—why should not all who happen to dislike the author's speculations upon German dragoons, or anything else, pelt *him?* It is happier for none than for the author, that the world at large has got beyond Register law, and Fleet-Street divinity.

One point elucidated in these "Letters" is too curious to be omitted; as an instance of the folly to which bigotry will stoop, and the nonsense which is good enough to be uttered when somebody is to be oppressed. A statement was advanced by the member for Oxford, that some Jew, residing in this country, supplied Napoleon Buonaparte with a considerable sum of money during the late war. On this the author of the Letters comes to the following conclusion.

'After taking some trouble to inquire into the grounds of the Hon. Baronet's assertion, I have arrived at the conclusion that it must be founded on the case of Mr. Alexander Lindo, a French Jew, resident in Jamaica, who took bills of exchange, drawn upon the French treasury, of General Le Clair, to the amount of £200,000, during the *peace* of Amiens. This sum was recovered after the recommencement of the war; and I have no doubt the Hon. Baronet will acknowledge whether this be or not the circumstance to which he alluded.'

The only other of the inanities uttered by the opponents of the Jews on which it seems necessary to remark, is the hope expressed in some quarter, that the question would be set at rest. Was such a question ever set at rest?—except in one way. And is it conceivable that it really occurred to the mind of any individual, that the contest was for anything but *time;* or the effort was anything but that of a virtually beaten party, to put off the period of submission to a future hour?

Some stress, too, appears to have been laid on the assertion, that all the members of the disabled sects are not strenuous in their demands. Attempts were made to lay upon the table of the House of Commons, *one* Jew who was willing to take half. But in this there would have been nothing wonderful, even if it had succeeded. In the case of any oppression upon classes of men, there are always some individuals in these very classes, who contrive to make a good thing for themselves out of the oppression. The leading teachers, for example, in the case of a religious sect, are always exposed to the suggestion, that their individual importance depends upon the maintenance of the separation. And though this may not always go the length of bringing them into active opposition, it always forms a counterpoise to a certain extent. Sometimes also, where the habits of the separated party have been long formed to their circumstances, certain conveniences may arise, which in their actual state of feeling will go far to balance their dislike to the exclusion. The quakers for instance, may feel it very comfortable in many cases to be sheltered behind their inability to swear. But here the question occurs, of why the rest of the community should be subjected to the counter inconvenience proceeding from their exemption. Why, for instance, should not the difficulty be got over, by removing the noxious and

truth-destroying practice of oath-taking, and at once securing the religious sanction where it exists, and the worldly one whether the other exists or not, by attaching the present penalties of perjury, to an engagement by the speaker to speak the truth, the whole truth &c., "as he shall now and hereafter answer "for the same." So small is the practical difficulty arising from the differences among sects, that it would be hazarding very little to say, that a committee of thoroughly honest men might in a week lay down such arrangements, as should make the Episcopalian lie down with the lambs of the flock of Joanna Southcote, and the Quaker unite with the Jumper, if not in jumping, in performing all the offices that can with propriety be required by law of an active citizen.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 July, 1830.

ART. XVI.—*Causes and Cure of the present Distress.* Ridgway. 1830.

WHEN some people protest there is a distress, and others that there is not a distress, the natural solution of the difficulty is, that some are distressed and others are in no distress at all. And it seems to be capable of proof, that such a distress as this, is all this distressful world is capable of. To demand that before the existence of distress was admitted, it should be proved that the king upon the throne was suffering extremity for want of nourishing food, or an archbishop was confined to his room by the consequences of a long course of oatmeal-porridge, would be manifestly outrageous and absurd. And by parity of reasoning, dukes, earls, viscounts, and so on to any extent down the ladder of honour in the Red Book, may by possibility be in no state of suffering, and still there may be "a distress" in the only sense in which in the nature of things it can exist. To demand therefore that a distress shall be universal, is like demanding that there shall be held to be no plague unless everybody has died of it. And to doubt or demur as to the existence of the evil upon such a ground, would be as unreasonable in one case as in the other.

Next to the plea of the *non-universality* of the distress, comes the plea of its being *temporary;* founded on the fact that a distress, like an ague, has its periods of intermission and exacerbation. The mere connexion of human affairs with the seasons of the year, with seed-time and harvest, with fair weather and foul, with passable roads and impassable, with fine working weather and weather when no man can work, is enough to establish a variation in the feeling of distress, a *frying-pan* and *fire* kind of difference, which may be easily represented by the interested, as a reason for postponing or omitting the consideration of the mischief. As has been stated, most probably with accurate

knowledge of the fact, by Mr. Sadler,—it is as impossible that the return of spring should not bring with it a degree of comparative relief, as that it should not produce a single bud or blade of grass. By the time, therefore, that the present article has a chance of being before the public, the cry will very probably have been raised, that the distress is over. If so, all that can be said is, that it will be ready for the next. "*Long "live the Sultan Mahmoud,*" said the marrying owl, "*for "there will be no want of ruined villages.*" If our rural Sultans continue in their present mind, there will be no fear of wanting a distress to write about. Whether they *will* continue in that mind, is not so certain; for they, like other men, are held to be able to take their fingers out of the fire when they feel that they are burnt. The only hope is, that they may make the discovery and act upon it, before their neighbours' digits are roasted to a cinder.

One way of knowing whether there is a distress, is to find out whether proper steps are taken for making one. Suppose then, that the country, by conquest or otherwise, had fallen into the hands of rulers possessed of irresistible power, who for the gratification of political jealousy or some unassigned motive, were bent on raising up the greatest practicable quantity of distress within the limits of their dominion. And do not let it be supposed, that they are vulgar mischief-makers, whose ideas of evil are limited to brute and mechanical violence; but people of some cunning in their vocation, able to foresee the dangers connected with making themselves the direct distributors of suffering, and to calculate the vast advantage of persuading one man to inflict it on another.

Suppose then such rulers, acting by the instigation of the devil, as the lawyers say who know,—or any other instigation that may suit; and ask whether a committee in Pandæmonium could favour them with a better recipe than this:—

Sell A and his fellow-craftsmen a monopoly of some specified thing in which they deal; with an understanding, that all *they* gain will be taken from somebody else *twice**, first, by the taking an equal quantity of custom from some other trader, and secondly, by taking from the consumer the difference between the dear article and the cheap. But *sell*, not *give* it; and let the price paid, be an engagement to support the government as being the fountain of the good. As the thing sold must have a name, call it *protection*. Do the same to B, C, D, and

* This is believed to be the first place in which the radical principle of Free Trade is so distinctly announced in arithmetical terms; though it is substantially described in preceding articles, and in the "Catechism on the Corn Laws," at earlier periods.—*Author, on republication in* 1839.

all the trades and letters in the alphabet; in fact keep open shop, where every man may buy a portion of the public loss, whose adherence is worth having. Let everybody gain from everybody; with an understanding that the losses of the latter *everybody*, shall in each particular case be double the profits of the first. And let all this be done with pure paternal kindness; demanding at the same time filial respect and gratitude, for the favours on all conferred. Use everybody as Izaak Walton does his frog,—"as though you loved him." See that there be none in the land, to whom this claim for gratitude does not extend. Let every man have his share in the obligation; let there be no individual that has not the same cause for thankfulness, that his lot is cast under a government of so much benevolence and equal-handedness.

To be particular,—for blessings in the heap are undervalued, —let the grace and favour be in a peculiar manner applied to bread. It is the staff of life; it is what all human beings are equally concerned in; spare, then, no pains, that as regards this, the system may be complete. If your machine turns upon anything like a *representation* principle, let it be settled that none shall be your representatives that do not deal in corn. The effect will be found prodigious, in producing the security desired. It is not matter of theory, but practice, that nothing binds a representative to a given course, like dealing in the thing on which he is to legislate. Make all your representatives corn-dealers; it is the sure way to make them know how to legislate on corn. In these ways you may do much; but it is possible to do more, and a great genius never thinks anything done, as long as there is anything left to do.

Be clear upon taxation. Blunders on this head have been the cause of much unintentional diminution of evil, and the loss of much power for inflicting more. It is a perplexed subject; and if *you* are clear upon it, you may be quite sure your opponents will not, which is an advantage. Taxation is, or ought to be, in the main, the taking money from the people for your own use. It is therefore one of the pleasantest ways of causing a distress; but it requires to be well managed. There are three sorts of persons on whom the effects must be calculated, besides the enjoyer. First, there are those out of whose pockets the tax is finally paid. That, you will say, is simple. Next, there are the operatives, or those who live by the demand for labour. And here you are to be aware,—though there is no use in saying much about it, and indeed you would not persuade many of the fact if you were to try,—that this is a class from which it is almost impossible to get money by taxation. You may gain from them during the period that intervenes be-

tween laying a tax, and their being able to recover the amount in wages from their employers; and there may even be a portion which they never recover, and which will consequently be gained from themselves. But by far the greatest part of the tax will be ultimately taken from their employers. You may therefore get up a portion of distress among the working classes in this way; but not so large a portion as might be supposed. And you must recollect that the employers, the people who have wherewith to pay, are your milch cows, and must not be pressed too hard. You will ever bear in mind, that your object is not to destroy people, but to keep up a distress. Another use too, which may be made of your knowledge upon this point, is that if you happen at any time to be particularly hard pushed, you may throw a few taxes to the operatives; on beer for instance,—they are fond of beer. The operatives will be as glad of this, as if it was all given to them; but *you* will remember, that with the exception of a small portion which they pocket while the masters are bringing down their wages, the real *bonus* is to the masters, and to the growers of the stuff that beer is made of; who are a set much more able to be grateful than the other, and will be grateful to you accordingly. You will see how useful this may be made, if ever you should be in the situation of the monkey who is obliged to drop first one part of his load and then another, for the sake of escaping with what may finally be left.

But this is comparatively child's play. You are to remember that the great effects, the results in a broad style, are not to be produced by the pimping process of what can be taken from a man directly; but that the point of art, is so to lay your tax, that for every shilling taken directly, twenty shall be lost by the consequences. *Voilà le sublime du métier.* The first kind is a bare taking, which every novice is capable of; but this marks the artist, and leads the successful practitioner to distinction in his line. Note also, that in this way you get at that slippery class which evaded you before. You may in fact screw them to almost any extent you like. There is positively no limit to it, so long as there is a fragment of foreign trade which it is possible to cut off for the benefit of somebody at home; and the best of all is, that the operatives will never find you out. On the contrary, you may have any of them at your back you please, by talking to them of the protection you afford their own particular trade. They will be your best friends, your staunchest allies; only you must try to keep them in good humour about corn. They have all such a habit of using corn, that they are apt to forget that if they are to have their own particular monopoly, the corn-growers must have theirs. But

they will be accessible to reason on this head. "Live and let "live,"—"What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gan- "der,"—"Beautifully compact system of government,"—"Up "corn, up horn,"—"Land and trade must wax and wane to- "gether,"—and similar collections from the wisdom of anti- quity, will be enough to keep them in the right road. But never forget that the protection of the land-owners is the prin- cipal point; because it is the most difficult. Every inch you lose in any other quarter, is always felt there; for it is mani- festly impossible that protection there should long go on, if other people begin to grumble at the privation of their own. The ship-owners are a powerful race, and can make a great noise; but the difficulty is to keep them from breaking out into a cry for free trade in everything but ships. Be very civil to the ship-owners; as long as they keep off this point. Sugar, is an article on which you can do much. Besides, no man is obliged to eat sugar unless he likes; so that you can never be accused of cruelty. If there are two ways of getting sugar, a dear way and a cheap,—lay a tax upon the latter. It will clearly create a balance of loss to somebody, equal to the difference of price; and the inventors of the dear sugar will know they are obliged to you. There is no telling on how many occasions such people may be useful. Tea, is another thing of the same kind; be- sides, it is unwholesome. Though you may have no place where you can grow a dearer tea, you can send out men to buy it and sell it at a higher price. In this manner you may add considerably to a distress; and it falls on those only who are foolish enough to spend their money in foreign drinks. At the same time, expect some opposition from the ship-owners. But you must get up a race of *tea* ship-owners, and see that they spend more money than the others, and so they will keep them in check. If these are confined to the metropolis, it will be better; for otherwise they will be scattered, and might be con- founded with the rest. If the petty ship-owners, the "three- hundred ton" men, set up an outcry, throw out hints of a mo- nopoly of some kind for themselves. Say that the government is exceedingly well disposed to consider, &c.;—and when the pinch is over, you may forget it, or a minister may be trans- ferred.

If you are clever, you will find a multitude of opportunities for propping up your system, without the necessity of a hint on every particular occasion. In the eyes of a man of genius, every- thing falls of itself into two parts; the ways in which it may help his objects, and the ways in which it opposes them. An ecclesiastical establishment may often be made good use of; especially if its members are a minority. For it is clear that

such an establishment can do nothing but support you. Concentrate its wealth in as few hands as possible: for one man who has fifty thousand a-year by means of you, will exert himself with more effect than fifty thousand who could do almost as well without you, and would have been nearly as well off if they had been tailors.

When you lay a tax, consider whether by increasing the rate, its operativeness for your particular purpose may not be increased, at the expense of a very moderate diminution of the revenue. In fact there are many taxes, in which if it was possible to increase the rate till the revenue derived from them was nothing, it would be the maximum of good. Such, for instance, are those on literature; where it is clear that your real gain, will be in exact proportion to the unproductiveness of the tax. Fools do not always find this out; and there is a large proportion of fools among those you have to deal with. It is needless to tell you, that every addition to the expense of collection, is also so much gain. It is finding a living for so many individuals of sure principles, at the expense of those who most probably are of worse.

Remains only your foreign policy. And this, though it may not admit of being made operative directly, admits of it indirectly. Continually bear in mind, that in all governments founded on principles like yours, there is a strong under-current of hate and desire of change, if it is looked for in the proper places. There is therefore virtually a common cause. You may be reduced to many shifts; and often be obliged to do a little, where you would gladly do a great deal. But never let it be absent from you, that to make the most of that little, is the touch-stone of your capacity. And in reality, to serve your friends, does not require such overt acts as men suppose. A quiet encouragement, a lurking intimation of regard, will often produce as much effect as a more open demonstration. *Neutrality*, is one of the most useful weapons in your armoury; he that can be neutral whenever it suits his purpose, has half the battle in his hands. Whenever interference would be against your friends, you can be loud upon neutrality; when it would be the other way, then neutrality must have its bounds. No insult offered during the prosecution of this system needs move you from your purpose; because it is clear, that whoever is hit, it was not meant for *you*. If the power from whence it comes is comparatively contemptible, there is only the more reason why you should befriend him; and you may say he is too small to notice. This is a plan that has often been known to answer. Besides, it is necessary to husband your interference, for the case where there should really be a necessity for putting down

some great effort. The more cases you can produce of non-interference on the other side, the more easily you may say that non-interference cannot last for ever, and you must interfere in this. Remember that all governments are responsible to each other, for doing nothing whereby the others can be injured; and there is no injury to a government so serious, as allowing its natural enemies to get head in any quarter. Your whole system is but a tottering one; and may fall down like a house of cards at any moment, unless the greatest pains are taken to prevent the first shake. The art of a statesman is avowedly one of the most difficult in the world; and in proportion to its difficulty, is the merit of those who can keep the machine upon its legs in circumstances like yours.

If you are pressed by political opponents at home, the best resource is impertinence. Be imperious in the Commons, saucy in the Lords; and men will see that you belong to a regular government. But do not get an ill name by trying to maintain too long, what you are conscious you cannot keep. Act like a good general, and retreat as far as is necessary and no farther. There will generally be some small after-ground on which you can make a stand, and escape the imputation of having surrendered a principle. Be not too much disheartened, when you are obliged to give way. The world itself will not last for ever; and the utmost that can be expected from you, is that you shall make things last as long as they can. Have what a sailor calls "a good look-out ahead." There is no instrument so battered, so bankrupt in public opinion, but a game may turn up in which the card may be made to play; and the worse the card is, the more striking is the effect of bringing it into use. Be always ready to drop minor differences, where the greater interest is at stake; a turban may be as useful as a wig, and there is a littleness in being exclusive. In all countries, have a leaning towards the ruling powers; for they are as sheep among wolves. There would be no difficulty in government, if there was not a continual opposition between the governors and the governed. Nevertheless *talk* liberality, when there is no question of anything to be done; and you will find the use of it, when you have reasons for avoiding the subject.

Never wander from your principle, that public evil is the fountain of private good. Be convinced that all men have within them a leaning towards acknowledging this truth; and that whenever you try one of them on this ground, you have half a convert before you to begin with. There *is* no virtue; anything that goes by that name, is only ignorance of what is to be made by the opposite practice. Study history; for

the sake of the proofs it affords of this. Bear in mind that reputations are fallacious, and the applause of the public often ill bestowed; and that nothing can pretend to permanence, which does not begin by keeping up the existing order of things.

Impress on the rising generation, that liberal ideas are illiberal, and unfitting for a gentleman. Allow your young men to be republicans, Greek or Roman, till their fifteenth year; but after that, instil into them, that they must put away childish things, and apply themselves to the realities of life. But this relates only to youth of the higher classes; the rest will know nothing of republics, but by the thanksgiving-days in the book of common prayer, and an indistinct notion that there are some bad people without an established church, living under that title in America.

If by these and other means which your own genius will suggest, you can gain and preserve full power to maintain your system, it is hard if with moderate perseverance you do not raise up a distress. You will see that the operatives,—whom perhaps you thought invulnerable and past your reach,—will be the first that will begin to complain they cannot live. And next you will see the complaints extend themselves upwards, and upwards, and upwards,—not exactly in the shape of want of bread, but in the shape of the discovery that everybody,—except you and your particulars, who are living on the taxes, and take care that your shares of them shall be such as to make you always comfortable, —is unable to live as he used to do, and is therefore comparatively distressed. Nothing can be more curious, to anybody who has a taste for this kind of thing, than to witness the different features of the process. Some curse, some swear,—some turn heathens, some religious,—some try resistance, some die drinking the king's health in pump water;—but the greatest part will redouble their eagerness to make something by their neighbours' loss, and come to you for the means of carrying it into effect. And here you must act like a good commander, and make the war feed the war. As long as you can deny or evade the acknowledgment of the distress, it is perhaps best to do so; it is so much ground in reserve. The distress will fluctuate; therefore when it is worst, say it will be only temporary; and when it is better, say that it is gone. If you can find anybody that is worse off than his neighbours, you may say the distress is partial. Gain time in this way as long as you can. But when all this can be done no longer, the pretty play is, to make the distress contribute to its own support. There will probably be some-

body, who will call out for the removal, or at least the relaxation, of your system. Lay hold of this, and use it like wise men. Point to the loss that would follow to the trader who should lose his monopoly; but say nothing of the gain that would arise to the trader in favour of whom it should be opened, nor to the consumer who would gain the difference of price. Appeal to men's humanity whether the first should be allowed; but say nothing of the consequences of the other two. Talk loudly of the cruelty of cheapness, and the hard-heartedness of allowing men to buy at the lowest market, and you will be astonished to see what a multitude will run after you. Advance stoutly, that high prices of everything are what make all men rich; and a good half of the nation will follow you, as if you were the bottle-conjurer. If you have been brought up in that line, quote scripture; but, for the House of Commons, Virgil will do as well. When you attack Malthus, attribute to him everything he has never said, and omit all he has; it has been long approved the best mode of confutation. Encourage poetry; because poetry is fiction, and fiction is what is not true. Besides, the things most immediately dangerous to you, are generally said in prose. Make a great outcry about elegant literature; for distress is an inelegant thing, and elegant literature will never touch it. You may always have writers on your side, if there is anything to be had from you; and, like the seats in a theatre, the elegance will be in proportion to the price.

It is very useful to have a foreign nation, where you can try experiments which it would not be exactly safe to try at home. The uses of this are two; that you keep your hand in, and that you can contest a point on foreign ground instead of on your own. A good manager will generally make his struggle for prerogative, abroad; there is less lost if it fails, and if it succeeds, the advantage is as real as if it was gained elsewhere. Whenever foreign despotisms begin to give way, there will be danger of reform at home. Experience proves this maxim to be as needful to a statesman of your kind, as butter to a cook. War, in the acceptation of modern publicists, is self-defence against reform; and however just and necessary this may be, it is acknowledged to be better to carry it on in a foreign territory than your own.

If such a course of policy will not create and perpetuate a distress, the attempt may be given up in despair, and it may be set down as proved that the nation experimented on is inaccessible to human agency. And if all or most of the measures proposed, have their actual completion and exemplification in

the history of any country with which we have to do,—it would not be a far stretch of intellect to infer, that one step towards removing the misery would be to undo them. Let it be done with all the caution—short of standing still—which our ancestors would recommend; but let the trial be made and carried on, whether for everybody to rob everybody, is not a thing that men could live without. Remember that the demand is not for rash adoption, but for trial. The demand for caution in this world is confessedly so great, that when a wise child has put its finger in the fire, it always perceives the necessity of using a certain degree of caution before it takes it out.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 July, 1830.

*ART. XVIII.—1. *The Policy of Princes; an Essay, containing, together with much useful Advice to Legitimate Monarchs, a Faithful Picture of the Present State of Europe.* By a Member of the Austrian Legation.—London. Horatio Phillips. 1828. 8vo. pp. 115.

2. *Quarterly Review (No. LXXXV. Art. 7.) on the "Political Condition and Prospects of France."*

THE first of these productions is introduced for the purpose of pointing it out as the source from which the greatest part of the other has been taken without acknowledgment. The public will therefore have the opportunity of comparing the original Selkirk, with the additions that have been made by the ingenuity of the plagiarist.

The object of both is to inculcate the desirableness of establishing arbitrary power wherever it is practicable; and the last contains a special application to the apprehended possibility of introducing it at the present moment in France, through the instrumentality of the Bourbons. In fact it is the manifesto of the party, who having brought upon their country all the misery that has been consequent on its past efforts to uphold the interests of arbitrary power throughout the world, are looking out keenly for an opportunity of plunging it into accumulated evils from the same source. The high church and the tories snuff the possibility of another revolutionary war; and it is with a view to obtaining something like a fair con-

---

* This article possesses some interest, as having been published exactly a month before the Revolution of the "Three Days" in France; and for the various suggestions and parallels, which may occur to the reader at the present period.—*Author, on republication in* 1839.

sideration of their project before it is too late, that notice is here taken of the feeler which they have put out.

Everybody knows that during the latter half of the seventeenth century, political contests took place in England which ended, after considerable variety of fortune on both sides, in the entire discomfiture of the partisans of divine right, and the complete establishment of the principle of legitimacy, as construed to imply, that the sovereign chosen by a nation, whether native or of foreign birth, is the only legitimate, and that any other, however fortified by a line of ancestors, is what, for the sake of conveying the whole in a single word, the British constitution has designated by the term "Pretender." And for further elucidation in cases that might admit of it, it was clearly acknowledged and understood, that one of the most decisive marks and evidences of a "Pretender," consisted in his endeavouring to effect or perpetuate his establishment, by the operation of foreign armies. Such was the settlement upon which is founded the existing form of government in Great Britain. All men gave in their adhesion to it; and after the individuals engaged in the previous struggles had had time to disappear from the scene, all were loud in their professions of attachment. It became the common as well as the written law of the land; it was the bond that held the community together, the *principium et fons* from which were derived all the claims of the actual government to obedience, and all the security of individuals for good expected to be consequent thereon. He that doubted this,—or at all events, that gave action to his doubts,—was deemed a traitor, and is so still. It is not necessary to demand that he should be embowelled, or in other ways to countenance the execution of the sanguinary laws which men have always been too ready to make for the coercion of those who differ in opinion from themselves; but what is meant is, that the fact conveys that mixture of treachery, meanness, and dishonesty, which is popularly included under the epithet of traitor.

So far things went well. But human nature is feeble; and no man is to be trusted with doing justice in the converse of his own case. A contest arose with the colonies, in which, though the dispute was not on the legitimacy of an individual, the leading principles of public right which had been at stake in the British revolution, were all concerned, and all broken through. Fortunately for us of the present generation and for the world, the struggle on the British side was eminently unsuccessful. But the public spirit was perverted. Great masses of men had become accustomed to direct their feelings in the channel of hatred to popular rights; and it was not long

before an opportunity arose, for re-trying the old question with renewed prospects of success. France, actuated by sentiments for which she was in a great measure indebted to her communication with America, threw off the form of arbitrary government, for enduring which she had for a century been the common object of English mockery and scorn. She attempted to make a compact with the existing family, and found, as in England, that to make terms with *uningrafted* royalty, is only making an agreement with the wolf to keep the sheep. The king signed promises with one hand, and with the other invited foreign armies,—and was publicly executed for it, after the model which England had already given, and which she would probably follow again, if it were possible to conceive the reigning family supplanted by a Stuart who should repeat the cause.

It is needless to be minute. The foreigners, as all good men hoped, were driven back; and England, which had allowed itself to be inveigled into being a party to the unjust invasion, was reduced to that necessity, which if nations were wise, they would know it was always their interest to pray for, however disagreeable to national vanity the immediate sensation. If a nation does not wish for discreditable peace, it should avoid unjust war. That every unjust war may be followed by a discreditable peace, is at least one half of the blessings a patriot can invoke upon his country.

But the war began again, with extreme injustice on the part of England, and with the object (avowed, if not at the moment, at a subsequent period,) of checking the progress of opinions which could not be arrested during peace. And here commenced the misconduct and the misfortunes, of the country which had begun with such glorious justice and success. Little by little, it withdrew itself from the combat of opinion, and substituted one of brute strength in its stead; till at last, it became the mere property of the first of soldiers, and the struggle that began for the independence of nations, ended for knowing whether his mother's sons were to sit upon four boards covered with velvet, under the title of a throne. And then came a great military misfortune; incurred in a war abstractedly just, but incurred in great measure through the neglect of the principles of popular right in various accessory portions of the scene. Prodigious efforts were made to repair the loss; but the physical odds were too great, and the family which every village in France had sacrificed twenty of its children to keep out, as England had sacrificed hers to keep out the Stuarts, was brought back by foreign arms. In a year the popular sovereign returned, and was received by the united nation, without a musquet been fired in support of his opponents. And here

began the disgrace, which a follower of the house of Hanover would cheaply escape if he could make himself an Algerine. An agent of the Holy Alliance, rose in his place and said, that a million and a half of soldiers were ready to remove the nation's choice; and the people of England,—or a great and substantial part of them, among whom the remainder, if there was any, was scarcely to be discerned,—were mean enough, ignorant enough, traitors enough to their ancestors and to the principles by which alone they were creditably distinguished among the nations of Europe, to huzza for this great act of impious injustice, and throw back into the face of Providence the memory of a long history of benefits received in the course of honourable struggles against similar oppression. It is not often that the just cause fails; but it did fail. There is no use in confusing the subject with the qualities of armies. The question with regard to England is, not whether the razor did or did not cut well, but whether it was not employed in a detestable and murderous act. The question of morality is totally distinct from the merits of the machine; and the mind must approach to idiocy, which is unable to maintain the difference.

But when the French *William* was removed, the nation was still not brought so low, but that it could oblige the substituted individual to compound. And he compounded accordingly, by offering an engagement to adhere to certain modes of government, which were supposed to be most valued by the nation that was to submit to his embrace. The Charter was put forward, as the condition of his being endured;—it was the bribe which was to take the loathly bridegroom into the chamber of the belle. England,—or at least those who unhappily had the keeping of her honour—became a party to the discreditable transaction, by engaging to hold the back-door open for the rescue, in case the bride, like her of Lammermoor, attempted to defend herself by the application of cold steel. But mean as was this,—shameful and degrading as it was to a nation, which had itself resisted, and with success, a similar espousal,—England *did not* engage to keep the back-door open, though the detested lover should break all his engagements, and should say, for instance, that the contract which he held out as the price of consent, he would withdraw next morning by the right that every maker of a contract has to break it. England was a base bawd; but not so base as this. There are degrees of shame in the dirtiest vocations; and the acknowledgment of turpitude in any given degree, does not amount to an investiture with that which may be greater.

The *Stuart* whom the English people had been mean and foolish enough to assist in establishing in France, deported

himself as ill as he dared, and as well as he could not help. He put upon a gallant people and a brave army, the last insult of forcing them to march under the direction of the barbarians of the north, to invade another nation for the purpose of destroying constitutional freedom; and England, though not this time prominently assisting, was at hand to countenance the deed. He uttered from his ill-gotten throne a low falsehood, of precisely that nature and quality for which most languages reserve a term to convey the acme of opprobrium; and the Jacobite in England stood by, as he stands by now, to declare that "nothing but malevolence" could doubt a royal word. Years of non-resistance gave boldness; and his successor, at the instigation of that readiest instrument of political degradation an established priesthood, undertook to make the nation sound once more the base string of humility. Disgraceful agents of the vengeances of the intruded family, and men involved by public opinion in attempts at the assassination of the national sovereign like those encouraged by the Stuarts, were placed in the offices of the ministry; while on the army the experiment was tried, of placing it under the command of a deserter,—not a mere political turncoat, but one who had insinuated himself into a place of trust under the guarantee of honourable men, for the express purpose of deserting to the foreign enemy at the moment of a great national struggle, with arms and accoutrements. Military men in all countries stood aghast, to see that it was possible for men in arms to bend to such an infliction. The fierce spirit of soldierly brotherhood throughout the world, felt itself bearded and dishonoured; and the poorest sentinel was conscious of the insult to his craft. Under these circumstances there were positively men in England, who though pressed by no conqueror and urged on by no bayonet, volunteered to say that it was right, with such a ministry, to wait for *acts*. As if gross insult to every feeling of national honour and individual dignity, was not *an act*. Suppose in England, a man who had deserted to the French at Waterloo, was to be appointed to the Horse Guards,—*would that be an act?* The process of conviction may be slow; but God and nature in the end will vindicate the truth, that there is justice in national as well as personal relations, and that the true measure of right in all cases, is what men would willingly submit to for themselves.

To this experiment the French nation applied a determined and persevering resistance. The Chamber of Deputies, though filtered through every process which policy could invent for diminishing the operation of the national feeling, declared in terms which had no fault but that of being not sufficiently ex-

plicit, their refusal to co-operate with such a ministry. The head of the Bourbons dissolved the Chambers. All that was independent in France united in the determination to return the same men again. And here the question rests, and is to settle,—whether the will of an individual imposed by foreign arms is to reduce a great nation to the dregs of humiliation and political debasement, or the wishes of thirty-four millions of people are to hold him in check. The mighty question for which Englishmen fought and suffered, and which they, the first of men, had brought to a glorious termination in their own particular case,—is to be fought over again in France, and the confirmation or shaking of the English right is to hang on the result.

In the midst of this, the organ of the down-trodden party of arbitrary power in England puts forth a feeler to try the possibility of helping its friends abroad. The Bourbons are openly and in direct terms invited to put down the Charter, which was the instrument of their admission into the unfortunate country on which their presence is inflicted; and the expectation is held out by implication, that England would assist in this act of choice baseness and set-apart iniquity. The organ of the English priesthood talks loudly, of "buckling on their armour for another quarter of a century." It will be the fault of the English people if they have any armour to buckle on. When the members of an ecclesiastical establishment are thus put forward as the instigators of bloodshed and the advocates of arbitrary power, the people must be dull indeed who do not see in it the necessity of losing no fitting opportunity of reducing the gross temporalities of such a church, and bringing it to a state of depletion more consistent with its ghostly welfare.

And here let it be noted, that the struggle is one entirely of the Bourbons' own bringing on. There has been no attempt to move them from the throne to which they waded through the best blood of France; all that can be produced is passive resistance to causeless insult and wanton injury. Our high church promises us a twenty-five years war, in pure *gaieté de cœur*. It seems to think that men live only to fight battles, for the relish that is given thereby to priestly dinners on a thanksgiving-day. With the true recklessness of men whose vocation is to enjoy, they leave to others the calculation of what might happen if fortune should take the opposite side.

When Napoleon marched into Russia, the man who should have advised either him or France to believe, that in less than two years his capital might be occupied by his enemies, would have been received with contempt and violence, like what would await the individual who should insinuate to the absolutists of Great Britain, that arms are doubtful, and that it is much

easier to tell the issue of a war that has gone by, than of one that is to come. They think they have a divine right to success, and if things went ill, they would only have to multiply the fast-days in which they invoked the god of unjust wars against their enemies. History and experience are null to them; the heaviest mischances that have befallen unprincipled nations and arbitrary rulers, convey no lesson to the obtuseness of their organ. But there is an appeal from their insanity, to the good sense of the remainder of the community,—of that portion of it, who are sure to be present at the shaving of their own beard, and know that whatever may be the result, the benefit is for the absolutists, and the evil for themselves. To men of this kind—a cool and calculating generation, who love peace and ensue it, because in war the blows are for them, and the glory for their betters,—to such as these, it will not seem a superfluous question to demand, whether, if England should persist in holding herself out as the patroness of arbitrary power throughout the earth, it is not evident that the result must at some time or other be either a disgraceful peace, or the settling of the question by the arrival of the forces of the free world in her capital, and paying for the bridge at Washington, and for the five hundred millions of francs levied on the French people as the price of resistance to their Stuart. It matters not what ravishing intervals may have intervened, or how many ensigns shall have greatly risen through all the gradations of command. It is of no consequence how many patrons of Cornish boroughs shall have adorned their offspring with naval epaulettes, of this or that magnitude of bullion, and dignity of twist. When such a consummation comes,—and come it will,—the white gaiters of the Guards will be only pipe-clay, and the puce-coloured coat of the Master of the Ceremonies will not be worth a flea. The quid of hard and bitter degradation, will be all that will be left for Englishmen to chew; and why not avoid all this, as Napoleon might have done, by letting well alone? But calculations of this kind are not learned in the Thirty-nine Articles, nor stumbled on in the Athanasian Creed. Psalmody has no mention of them; and from "When the wicked man" till "two or three are gathered together," no vestiges of such a science are to be found. But still the question recurs, of why such counsellors are to travel beyond the limits of the Homilies, and turn their hands to guiding nations to ruin and to shame.

And what, after all, are the reasons given, for involving two great nations in sanguinary contest? They will be found reducible to this;—that in France there is a Chamber of Deputies elected by the people. The qualification is so high already, as to reduce the electors to 80,000 for all France, being scarcely

more than in four or five large towns in England. But the English absolutists cannot be content with this. There is popular election of some kind in France, and therefore the Reviewers and the Bourbons must march to put it down. The cause stated is an amusing one;—the Chamber is not in "*the desired harmony.*" Some people are of opinion that it *is* in harmony; at all events it is evident that it can carry a point by a majority of 40. Suppose that when the minister in England was in a minority of 17, it was proposed to bring in a foreign force, because the House of Commons was not in harmony.—But it is not in *the desired* harmony *; by which is meant, that it does not agree to submit to the agents of the foreigner. If the Chamber could have been induced by fear or temptation to give majorities of 40 the other way, does anybody believe that anything would have been heard of the want of harmony? Now the object of a Chamber or a House of Commons, is clearly that it shall have a voice; and the charge brought against the French Chamber is, that its voice is the wrong way. If this succeeds, how long will it be before the same charge may be brought against the House of Commons?

'It is an undoubted truth,' says the author [*Cottu*] quoted by the Quarterly Review, 'because it is founded in the nature of our being, that in every society, where there are rich and poor, the power *must* be vested in the rich, if the poor are to be prevented from swallowing up the wealthy.'—p. 217.

The English people give this a point-blank denial, and affirm that they have learned by painful experience, that the difficulty is not to prevent the poor from robbing, but the rich; and that a virtual power *must* be vested in the poor, if the rich are to be prevented from plundering them at will.

'For the same reason,' he adds, 'in every community where we find privileges which are established and recognised by the laws, the government of the country *must* belong essentially to the privileged orders in question, provided those privileges are not to be overturned.' —*Id.*

If privileges mean the power of oppressing, the assertion is true. The people of England know *that*, as well as a Councillor of the *Cour Royale* can teach them.

The object of M. Cottu, and of the Quarterly Reviewers who assist him with their commentary, is to set up a point-blank despotism in the hands of the privileged orders and the priest-

* In 1838 the Assembly of Lower Canada was found not in "*the desired harmony;*" and therefore the Whig ministers seized on the supplies by force, and hunted the members with detachments of light infantry. For all which, a day of retribution will come.—*Author, on republication in* 1839.

hood, subject only to the slightest degree of popular interference which can act as a valve to the great boiler, and prevent the whole from blowing up. It is the arbitrary power which our forefathers demolished; with the simple substitution of "church and privileged orders" for "church and king." The rules and regulations collected by experience for carrying on such impositions on this and other nations, appear under the name of "that sagacity which, having stood the wear and tear of so "many ages, is worth the whole march of modern intellect put "together!"—*p.* 219. It is true enough. "Naught's per-"manent among the human race," but the desire of tyranny; —excepting always, the determination to resist it. Let the church look to it, that the march of intellect does not walk over her, as it has walked over other forms and modifications of badly managed power, in spite of the "sagacity" which may have been handed down as an heir-loom through all the despotisms since Nimrod's.

But "it is quite clear that the experiment of giving a constitutional form of government to France has not succeeded." It is clear that the experiment of trying to have an agent of the foreigner upon the throne, with leave to bring back the old absolutism, has not succeeded. But not a fragment of evidence is there, that a king of honest views and patriotic feelings might not have got over even the vice of his origin, and have filled the throne with at least as much of quiet as the Dutch and German sovereigns who have reigned in England. If the experiment of *giving* a constitutional government has failed, it has been because it was given to be broken;—it has been because the restored monarchs have walked in the way of the restored monarchs in our own country, and have thereby to all appearance secured themselves the winding-up of a similar ejectment.

'The leading fallacy of the present times, we should say, is the supposition that free institutions,—that is, the mere forms of a free government,—will of themselves engender a love of freedom,—and the knowledge how freedom is to be enjoyed.'—*p.* 223.

The Edinburgh Reviewers memorably exploded the here intended fraud—when they likened it to the recommendation of their grandmothers, that little boys should not go into the water till they have learned to swim *. There may be struggles, and some danger; but how is it ever to be learned, if my grandmother is always to have her way.

'Unless the enormous power [of a representative chamber] be, in its turn, checked on every side, by what, in mechanics, are termed

* Ed. Rev., No. LXXXIV. Art. 2. On "Milton."

antagonist forces, it ceases to be an engine of good, and becomes either a mere mockery, or, more probably, a source of tyranny. If its members be elected by universal suffrage, it is quite clear that only one interest will, in fact, be represented—that of the most numerous or lowest class; and the government must speedily merge in a democracy; while if its members be nominated by the commands of the sovereign, like the senate of Buonaparte, it becomes a mere tool in a despot's hand.'—*p.* 225.

It is sufficient to point out the enormous fallacy contained in that part of the above passage, which is directed to universal suffrage. To say that if the poor man's money is allowed to pass in the market as well as that of the rich, *only one interest* (that of the poorest class) *will be represented*,—would be just as true, as wise, and as decorous as the other. But if the reader proceeds, he will find where the shoe pinches. There is a sore want in France; a deadly hiatus. "Our readers "will, no doubt, anticipate that *we allude chiefly to a church* "*establishment*, and to a hereditary aristocracy—neither of "which, unfortunately, France now possesses, or, we fear, is "likely to acquire in our time."—*p.* 226. It has been very commonly understood, that France had both; and that large sums had been taken from the people, under the pressure of foreign armies, to secure their maintenance. But they are not yet of the right kind; they are not strong enough to insure the right way of thinking at elections.

'But of this great and eminently important branch of a constitutional monarchy, France is not only entirely destitute;—by her laws relating to succession, and still more fatally, by the sentiments of the mass of the population, she is absolutely shut out from all near prospect [*how distressful!*] of enjoying an aristocracy worthy of the name. It is even worse, in some respects, in France than it is in America, where the laws leave men to appropriate their estates as they please—a privilege of which, it is true, very few avail themselves, or indeed, can well avail themselves, seeing that the tide of public opinion is decidedly adverse to unequal distributions. But in France the laws dictate, despotically, the distribution, and, by obliging men to divide their property, not only contribute to split the whole country into potato-fields, but essentially diminish one of the highest motives to action, and, at all events, effectually prevent the growth of an aristocracy of wealth.'—*p.* 227.

France and America, and all countries which may aspire to be free, will be under obligations to the Quarterly Review for the unaffected manner in which it has given its sanction to their already formed opinions. "Surely in vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird." It must be one of those simple fowl which voyagers chronicle by names indicative of their stolidity, that would see the English priesthood spreading

abroad its toils, and not smile at the innocence of its employment. Could not the Quarterly Reviewers put a little salt upon the tails of the Deputies; and persuade them to remove the laws which prevent men from starving their younger children, to compose an *aristocrate* in the eldest?

The Quarterly Review raves, when it thinks upon America. That glorious migration of British freedom into a land where delusion had as yet no root, calls up, as it ought to do, the bile of all, that hate freedom every-where, and most at home.

'From the hour that, in an access of passion, they [the Americans] chose to fling themselves away from their king, and to relinquish the immense benefits arising from a government checked by a powerful aristocracy, and allied with a church establishment, and trusted exclusively to the democratical branch of the community, they have been doing nothing but propagating the species, and chopping down forests, without advancing the cause of good government, or of any branch of human knowledge, science, or art, one jot.'—*p.* 237.

Upon what sack has this Falstaff fed, that he is grown so gross? Where is it that the Americans have failed? Is it that they have paid for no palaces and pulled them down again? That they have given no annuities to keep up the race of Presidents, nor held delicate investigations upon the morals of their wives? Or—*tantaene animis cœlestibus irae*—is it possible that all this can be because they have voted no money for new churches? The cause is clear; in some way or other they have not paid. Whether they have advanced the cause of good government, the government of England will probably at some time know. Of arts, they have at least promoted one, of all others the most wanted in this realm of ours,—that of enabling men to keep their own money, from the clutches of those who desire to be familiar with their pockets.

'There is a second grand desideratum towards the construction of a firm and thoroughly free constitution, which the French seem to be as little in the way of providing for themselves, as they are in the case of an aristocracy. We allude to *a wealthy, powerful, highly educated, and virtuous church establishment*, in joint alliance with the state and with the people.'—*p.* 228.

Perhaps the Anglicans could supply France with a wealthy, highly educated, and virtuous church establishment; provided the wealth and the power were found for them by the French people. There is something intolerably impudent in these comments on the deficiencies of their neighbours, coming as they do, from people who are barely tolerated at home. "Persons are very apt to forget, in England, when they talk

" of the alliance between church and king, that the alliance " between church and people is incomparably more powerful; " and that it is, in fact, to this intimate, popular union, that " the alliance between the church and the state owes nearly all " its utility."—*p.* 228. If the intention is to state that there *is* an intimate union between church and people, the opportunity is too good to be lost, to contradict the fact. The church which is called established, as being established in the possession of the wealth, is in reality a rapidly declining minority. So far is it in the main from having a hold on the affections of the country, that there is no religious body in the world, of which the teachers are the objects of so much distrust. Maintained in an unpopular mode, and considered as little more than an offset of the classes which live upon the public, they are viewed as being covertly in England, what they are openly in France, the prompters and suborners of arbitrary power, a hostile force quartered on the people, and ready to support all governments in an attack upon their rights.

'The action and re-action, indeed, between the church and the community, and thence between the community at large and the government, are the parts of the system, in England, the best worthy of attentive study.'—*p.* 229.

They mean the tithes! The action and re-action, indeed, in England, are wonderful. But it is all nothing to what they are in Ireland. It is there that a foreigner should have been directed, if he was to be convinced of the real blessing of a wealthy and a virtuous church establishment.

'Of all this, however, there is not the slightest vestige remaining—if, indeed, there ever was much—in France.—In Spain, it is quite another story: there, the church, government, and people, are all agreed, and the despotism is not only complete but popular,—it is exactly what the mass of the nation like, and nothing, we are persuaded, would be more annoying to them than any change in this matter'.—*p.* 229.

It was also understood, that before the revolution, the tithes in France were of great amount, and the clergy wealthy if not virtuous. In Spain, it is well known, that 100,000 men were required but just now, to keep the clergy in the saddle; and that they would be turned under the belly of the mule tomorrow, if the 100,000 men should employ themselves in establishing the independence of their own country. These are inaccuracies; small, but worth pointing out.

'We have no notion, indeed, that in any country, or under any form of government which human ingenuity can devise, genuine freedom is to be looked for, unless, in addition to the intelligence so much

harped upon, there be a good solid substratum of morals, and, above all, of that domestic fidelity, or fireside honour and loyalty which are true to all changes of fortune. Now, there is too much evidence to show that the French people at the present time hold these things nearly as cheap as they notoriously do religion.'—*p.* 230.

The invention of steam-boats has let the English people into the secret, that the French are the more moral of the two. But what is "fireside honour and loyalty?" Does it mean anything but zeal to serve a foreign appointee,—that zeal, in short, in which the English were so lamentably deficient, when they sent their Stuart to find a Hartwell at St. Germain? It would be pleasing to know, whether there are any loyal negroes in Jamaica. Not *drivers*, but loyal *field negroes*. If there are, it would be a gratifying elucidation of the term, and of the church's explanation.

But a weighty consideration is to come. In England, "the "newspapers are merely the organs or mouth-pieces of the "general will;" in France, "the journalists *direct* the public "opinion." [*p.* 232.] There had been hope, that this piece of dullness had been confined to the royalists of France; and that no Englishman would have committed himself by its adoption. Is not a French journal written to be sold; and is it not in consequence addressed to a certain class, who it is hoped will buy? Are there royalists in France only because there is a paper called the *Drapeau Blanc;* and is it the *Constitutionnel* that has made all the constitutionalists since the Empire? "The mass of the people, both in Paris and in the country, "take their tone from these metropolitan journals: a very few "active men lead the whole nation, and have, in fact, a mo- "nopoly of the manufacture of public sentiment." They at all events lead the nation two ways; unless the matter of complaint is, that the people will not read the royalist journals, and insist on reading the others. But how does this agree with the assertion that the people are only led? Who leads them not to be led by the royalists; and why do not the royalists lead them the other way? If "a small number of busy "persons dictate to *la grande nation* how it should feel, think, "and act,"—why are not the royalists busy,—or, being busy, why is it without effect? The answer is too plain to be put in words. It is one of those cases where inspection is the best induction to the truth.

'One of two things must happen:—Charles X. will obtain a much greater share of power—or the people will usurp the sovereignty, and either overturn the throne by sheer force, as they did before, or reduce the wearer of the crown to a sort of president of their democracy.'—*p.* 234.

Hearken to the doctrine of the true church. An expelled family has been restored by foreign arms, as James *was not;* and when the people keep them within bounds, they "usurp "the sovereignty." Truly it is easy to see which way the wind lies, with the constituents of the Quarterly Review. And here note the bitter error a nation commits, when under any pressure of circumstances, it allows a doubt or uncertainty to remain upon that corner-stone of all rational freedom, the brightest part of the British Constitution of the Revolution, *the sovereignty of the people.* The evil genius in the Arabian Nights takes refuge in a melon-seed in the figure of a worm, and the good genius his adversary omits picking up that single grain, and thereby condemns herself to an age of woe. The sovereignty of the people, on the occasion of the French Charter, *was that grain.* Absolutists and priests may rail; but the nation which, either directly or by implication, allows any doubt to exist on the situation of the source of sovereign power, has only treasured up for itself a future struggle, and deferred the hour of national independence and domestic peace.

'What we should like to see in France, as being most conducive to the advancement of its best interests, would be the restoration of the ancient authority of the crown, without its old attendant abuses. The days of privileged orders, unequal taxation, arbitrary imprisonments, forced services, and so on, are gone by, we hope for ever, and we have no reason to suppose that the Bourbons, or their friends, can possibly have the smallest wish to restore such manifest evils. But we are quite certain that any other military chief whom the French might call in to take the place of their legitimate monarch, would, as a matter of course, in imitation of Buonaparte, re-establish, with tenfold rigour, all those privileges and unjust exemptions—of which we hear so much when the "ancien régime" is referred to, and so little when the iron period of the Empire is the subject of discussion.' —*p.* 239.

So would they reason for England, if they saw a prospect of success. They beg for their "legitimate" monarch, the power of abuse, without the abuses. The spirit which placed the House of Hanover on the throne of England is not brought so low, but that enough can be found to throw a denial in their teeth, when they thus apply the word "legitimate." What, too, were the privileges and unjust exemptions established by Napoleon? Was not a noble who had served France, as good a noble as one who had fought against it? And was there not this difference, whatever were the evils,—that in one case they were the acts of a government established by the French people, and in the other case by foreigners? How long would the English endure their present ills, if they were the acts of a government imposed by foreign arms?

But the heart of the English Tory is not so hard as has been supposed. He also has his plan for advancing liberty in France; and what is it? That the king shall be put in possession of absolute power, the Charter abolished, the press restrained, and then "the Bourbons will be compelled, as a matter of necessity, "if not of choice, to relax gradually their authority, so as to "allow the nation quite as much freedom of action as they can "profit by."—*p.* 239.

'We therefore hope and trust that the king and his present ministers may succeed, if such be their object, in establishing a censorship on the press, and likewise in acquiring so decided a preponderance in the Chamber of Deputies, that its existence as an independent body capable of bearding the monarchy, as it has recently done, shall be no longer recognised. This, we own, will be a virtual abolition of the Charter, but the question is obviously reduced to this:—Shall the Monarchy, which is suitable to the country, be overthrown, or shall the Charter, which, in every possible view, is unsuitable to it, be abrogated?'—*p.* 239.

The English absolutists have thrown off the mask, and left mankind an eternal lesson on the impossibility of peace or truce with the defenders of arbitrary power. Every free man in the civilized world is put on his defence, and called upon to be stirring for the preservation of all that he may wish to keep. A few years ago these same men harangued on the security of royal pledges, and the folly of suspicion; and now they call upon their puppet in France to break his faith and theirs, and to move forward against the liberties of the French people, with a full confidence in their exertions to support.

The Quarterly Review has addressed the Bourbons, and has done its best to bring on the moment of a European Revolution. Now hear how the other side, if it was in a situation to be equally listened to, would address itself to those it may concern.

To the people of France it would begin, by imploring them to believe,—That the spirit which placed the reigning family upon the throne of England, though sorely trampled on, is not extinct. That it would be a libel and a falsehood, which should represent the British people of the present generation, as a party to the scheme of their oppression. That the English nation has long since weighed for itself the fallacies with which it is sought to deceive the Continent, and has written its answer in the blood of one Stuart, and the exile of the rest. That though it is too true, that it gave its assistance to inflict on others what it had successfully resisted for itself, this was done under the influence of strong delusions, and not without a vigorous resistance on the part of the honest portion of the com-

munity; and that in the course of nearly half a century, the honesty has increased, and the delusions have passed away. That the body of sane Englishmen view with intense interest the repetition of their own struggle with the Stuart, in the country of their neighbours; and see in all its bearings, the vast concern they have in the success or failure of the contest. That the community of England of the present day, do not desire their aristocracy to have a garden of experiment in France, for the cultivation of slips of despotism to be transplanted among themselves. That on the contrary they know full well, there is a common interest and a common cause, and the battle of the English electors is being fought in the French Chamber. Evidence enough has been given of the desire of the French nation to live in quiet. But if this desire is finally in vain, and the French people are pushed by the activity of their oppressors to the necessity of physical resistance,—*then* they are exhorted to recollect the invincible strength which the hour of revolution gives to every nation;—to look at their own history and England's;—to remember that all the nations of the European continent are secretly on their side, and that in each of these countries their adversaries have an enemy to contend with that none can quell, their own armies and deceived and insulted population;—to reflect, that, till her leader's misconduct had caused the *people* of Europe to be against her, France was the right eye of the world, and that she has only to avoid the errors to resume the station;—to be persuaded, that civilized men everywhere are waiting like dogs of chase in the slips, for the signal to overturn the existing oppression which weighs upon the world, and move forward in the great cause, the *grande pensée*, of the INDEPENDENCE OF NATIONS. Mankind is sick of asking the Cossacks of the Don, whether a constitution may exist in Portugal, and which way the French Chamber shall vote upon the ministry. It is time that all this should end; but, divided as they are, individual nations must hold back, till some irresistible necessity appears for action. The European continent is one great mass of fireworks, waiting only for the match to be applied in any part; and if the Bourbons insist on doing it, there is no fear but they will have light to set their hoods, in any place to which they may carry their repentance and their punishment. If foreigners interfere, old men in England will become young, at hearing again how a gallant nation has chased its enemies from post to post,—and the banner of independence flown from capital to capital, till it has driven the barbarians into their frightful deserts, and saved the British people from being twitted by another Castlereagh, with the impossibility of resistance to a Holy-Alliance minister.

They will not forget *Poland;* the first battalion that marches against the existing despotisms in Europe, will write Poland on its colours. France will know how to employ the legacy of her great, though erring, chief; and in two years from the suppression of the Charter, a French army may be looked for on the Niemen. All this we shall owe the Bourbons, and their English counsellors. May heaven protect the Bourbons, the best friends of liberty throughout the world, and send them no lack of priests to prompt them, in their country or in ours!

To the oppressed nations of the Continent, the same voice would call, and exhort them to be patient a little longer;—to avoid all insulated efforts;—to husband their means and their men;—to bow the head for the present, in full assurance that they shall ere long carry it proudly in the presence of their enemies;—to cultivate a general system of holding back, as knowing that the difficulty is not to act but to keep men from acting, and that their adversaries are burning to give the signal, which will loose the imprisoned angels, and give scope to the energies of religious and civil liberty throughout the world. The time is not yet; nor till the enemy shall chuse to move against what of freedom there is left.

To the people of England it would cry aloud, to look to the example of their ancestors; to ask themselves what happiness, what honour, what advantage, they and each of them have derived or will derive, from making themselves the engines of the arbitrary power their fathers trampled on. It would exhort them to recollect, that history and experience are not lost upon the wise; that Providence has determined that he who would reap in summer, must sow in winter; and that all human good, or escape from evil, is held out as the prize of foresight and exertion. The people of England have not a Stuart; and can bestir themselves if they will. It is for them to judge, whether it is not high time to be up and doing. If this activity is unpleasing any where, the blame is with those who chose to beat the drum ecclesiastic in England for the Stuart in France. The existing race of Englishmen have lived through enough of history, to know the way in which a ministry of hacknied absolutists, if such should hold the reins when the time for decision comes, would push them to its purpose. At the best, it would be insidious neutrality, ending in pouncing on the cause of freedom in the most vulnerable point. The only chance of the English people is to *prevent.* Has the actual ministry taken the reasonable measures, to prevent mischief so far as in it lies; or is it pushing the French Stuart to his attempt, in calculation on the result? Many have vehemently suspected the

latter ; and when men lie under suspicion and take not the reasonable course to obviate it, fools only are any longer open to be deceived. Has the ministry, for instance, represented to the French royalists, that if they invade the Charter, the contemplated object of agreement, the *casus fœderis*, with England is removed ? If it has not, why has it not ? and why should the English people tempt the chicanery of absolutism in their own camp to try its chance ? To destroy its hopes, they have only to speak out, in those ways which, through the exertions of their forefathers, they happily possess. Let them approach the House of Commons and say to it,—That its Petitioners are deeply interested in the preservation of the principle which led to the removal of the house of Stuart, and the placing the house of Hanover upon the British throne. That the Petitioners believe the essence of this principle to consist in the avowal of the right of a nation to remove a king who breaks his contract with the people, and the illegitimacy of any government established by foreign force. That the Petitioners apprehend that an adhesion to this principle forms the bond of allegiance under the British Crown, and that any person who should advise or abet the infraction of the same, would be justly subject to the penalties of treason. That next to invading the principle at home, the highest degree of crime is the invading it abroad ; and the Petitioners conceive that the establishing or assisting to establish any king or family in a foreign country, against the will of the people of such country, constitutes an invasion as aforesaid. That the Petitioners have grievously suffered, and are now suffering, through the breaches made on this principle by past ministers ; and are deeply anxious that their sufferings should not be increased, either by further pecuniary burdens, or by the incurring those dangers and evils which would arise in the present day from an infraction of the bond of national allegiance in Great Britain. That the Petitioners well know, that at the conclusion of the late war, a compact distinguished by the title of the Charter was entered into between the head of the family of Bourbon and the French people, and as such was the means of entry and establishment of the said family on the throne of France, Great Britain being in certain ways and to certain purposes a party to the same, and more particularly in respect of certain guarantees touching the disposal and maintenance of the Belgic provinces previously making part of the French territory. That they are further aware, that at the present moment an agitation exists in France, not arising from any attempt on the part of the French people to abolish or remove such compact or Charter, but from attempts on the part of the restored family

or their advisers, to alter the construction or interpretation of the same, in manner that has not prevailed at any previous time since the acceptance of the compact. That the Petitioners and others, for the preservation of their just interests and the allaying of their just fears as herein stated, are most anxious to be informed, whether the ministers of the Crown have taken such precautionary steps as are in their power, for assuring and impressing on the family of Bourbon now ruling in France or their advisers, that in the event of any infraction on their part, of the compact or Charter whereto England was or is by agreement in certain ways and to certain purposes a party, all bond or obligation dependent on such agreement, so far as such family aforesaid or their advisers should in virtue thereof expect or demand aid, assistance, or countenance from England, will be *ipso facto* null and void. That the Petitioners therefore pray the Honourable House, to take such measures, and call for such information and declarations on the part of the ministers and advisers of the Crown, as shall tend to relieve the Petitioners from their just apprehensions in the matters above set forth.—Let them do this, or something of like import. Let them do it wherever ten men are gathered together; and then if their children are slaughtered in future wars against the rights of nations, and their property loaded with double debt for the same dishonourable purpose, they will at least have the satisfaction of remembering they tried to hinder it. Let the people everywhere, forget minor disputes, and give their support to any leaders who will lead the right way. The English aristocracy are not so bad. Those who know them, know them to be gallant in field and pleasant in hall; in council, too, not insensible to the honour of being the best-born citizens in a free state. If any of them will stand up in their places for the independence of nations, they will be followed as their fathers were. What is an English nobleman, under a Holy Alliance government? Let them show themselves; and the Commons will not be backward to follow where they lead. Free men do not stand upon family differences, when the object is to oppose a common despotism.

Postscript, 28 July, 1830.

(From the Republication in form of a Pamphlet, which took place on the news of the resistance in Paris at the commencement of the "Three Days.")

This day have arrived the Ordonnances of the French king, abolishing the press, and destroying the right of election, in France; word for word as it was settled in the Quarterly Review two months ago. The thing is plainly out of the English Tories' mint. Within twenty-four hours of the same event, commenced the increased restrictions of the Whig Attorney-General on the periodical press in England. The enemies of

the people everywhere go hand in hand. In addition to this, the operation in France has been plainly kept back for the news of the dissolution of the English parliament; which prevents any opposition being made by means of motions in either House. If the people of England, at this moment about to be assembled in their own elections, will not think of these things when the beginning of the movement is before their eyes; all that is begged of them is, that they will not grumble when their own right of election is taken away. It would be pitiful.

SECOND POSTSCRIPT, 6 August, 1830.

(From a subsequent Edition of the same Pamphlet.)

The advice of the English High Church and Tory party has been taken; and the Bourbons are driven from France.

All persons to whom the expense is of no importance, are requested to preserve the present pamphlet, as evidence of the fact that two months before the events at Paris, the proceedings of the destroyed tyranny were recommended in detail by the organ of the English absolutists.

Has the Quarterly Review nothing else it could recommend?

After the glorious liberation of the press in France, how long are the people of England to endure the restraints upon their own press, the last of which was laid on within twenty-four hours of the events at Paris?

PROGRAMME to the WESTMINSTER REVIEW for 1 Oct. 1830.

The incredible events which have altered the position of everything in Europe, have opened new prospects to the organs of popular sentiment in Great Britain. *Il n'y a plus de Manche*, —to apply to the Channel what was said of the Pyrenees,— is the only phrase that can express the change. Literature has its alliances as well as war. The list that follows, is one which free men may hail with pride. (*Here followed a list of foreign publications, mostly connected with the late transactions.*)

WESTMINSTER REVIEW. 1 October, 1830.

Art. XVII.—*The First Book of Euclid's Elements. With Alterations and Familiar Notes. Being an attempt to get rid of Axioms altogether; and to establish the Theory of Parallel Lines without the introduction of any principle not common to other parts of the Elements.* By a Member of the University of Cambridge*. Third Edition.—London. R. Heward. 1830.

THIS is an attempt to carry radicalism into Geometry; always meaning by radicalism, the application of sound

* The author of the present Work; whose name was to the Preface. Another Edition with the altered title of "Geometry without Axioms," is referred to in a subsequent Article (Vol. III. p. 79).

reason to tracing consequences to their *roots*. To those who do not happen to be familiar with the facts, it may be useful to be told, that after all the boast of geometricians of possessing an *exact science*, their science has really been founded on taking for granted a number of propositions under the title of Axioms, some of which were only specimens of slovenly acquiescence in assertion where demonstration might easily have been had, but others were in reality the begging of questions which had quite as much need of demonstration as the generality of those to which demonstration was applied. In this condition of the science it may be matter of surprise, that no interested supporter of things as they ought not to be, ever bethought himself of appealing to the state of geometry, as evidence of the impossibility of applying rigid demonstration to anything, and the necessity there is in all human affairs for resting on some assumption or other, which mankind must be taught to believe without proof.

The ready defence will be, that the points taken for granted, were what everybody knew to be true. The reply to which is, that in the first place, if they were ever so true, no good reason can be given why a thing should not be demonstrated if it can; and in the next, that the points taken for granted, or some of them, were *not* such as everybody knew to be true, with anything like that precision of knowledge, which it is the object of science to effect.

A common carpenter has a certain sort of knowledge, that if he draws a triangle with two of its sides equal, the two angles or corners opposite to these sides will be found equal also; and nobody has any intention of setting up an assertion that the carpenter is wrong. Why then does the geometrician disturb himself with searching for what he calls a *demonstration*? and why does not he write down the fact, and give the carpenter as his authority? First, because the carpenter's observation amounts, at best, to a proof of nothing but that in a certain number of instances he found the proposition hold good; but if the geometrician can detect the reason, why the proposition must hold good not only in all the instances which the carpenter *did* try, but in all that he *did not* try besides, he has manifestly gained a march upon his rival, and in the space of a few minutes done something vastly more complete, convincing, and satisfactory, than all that has been established on the subject by the *rule of thumb*, in the process of the carpenter's whole life, and the lives of all possible carpenters to boot. Secondly, because, though there may or may not be much opening for mistake in this particular observation, yet if a collection of observations of the same description were written down in a

book and entitled a treatise on geometry, it is highly probable, or more properly quite certain, that in some or other of them there would be a powerful admixture of error, through the want of a comprehensive view of all the circumstances affecting the result. Thirdly, because the same application of reason which enables the geometer to give the general and universal solution of this particular proposition, will enable him to advance rapidly to the discovery and demonstration of many propositions which all the carpenters in the world would never have dreamt of, and which it would have been utterly in vain to expect that men should ever discover by a merely tentative process. And lastly, because the very exercise and practice of all this, in addition to what may turn out to be the practical value of the discoveries that result, is of high utility from its tendency to throw light on the processes of reasoning, and the conduct of sound argument in general.

The question, therefore, of whether a geometer has well or ill done his work, will rest to a considerable extent upon determining, how far he has succeeded in taking his propositions out of their primitive state of assertions found to accord with a limited number of experiments, and placing them in the condition of truths which can be shown to be necessarily applicable to all possible experiments. And this last operation, is what is meant by *demonstration*.

The attempt to get rid of Axioms, is laudable, if successful; but like other rebellions, it must be justified by success. No good ever yet came of axioms. Legitimacy is an axiom; persecution is an axiom. The proposition must be such as was never started on this earth, if it cannot be established by the intervention of an axiom.

The modes in which the present attempt has been conducted, may (with the exception of the complicated question on Parallel Lines) be briefly described.

Instead of calling on mankind to declare that they always knew that "things equal to the same were equal to one another," and moreover that "magnitudes which coincide with one another are equal to one another,"—they are invited to consider, whether the circumstance that the boundaries would coincide if they could be applied to one another without bar of corporeal substance, or at all events might be made capable of doing so by merely a different arrangement of parts,—is not in reality, as respects the objects of geometry, the definition of *equality*. But if so, this criterion of equality is as applicable to three magnitudes at once, as to two; for it is only an act of the imagination in any. If this be true, it removes the First and Eighth Axioms of Euclid at once. It converts

the Eighth into a Definition, and the First into a Theorem; and all the intermediate ones, resolve themselves into Corollaries to the First.

That "the whole is greater than its part," is omitted as only an identical proposition, that "the greatest is greatest."

That "two straight lines cannot inclose a space," is taken, as Euclid really makes it, for the Definition of straight lines*. This may be right or wrong; but it is nothing new, for it has been Euclid's for two thousand years. It has been objected to such a definition, that it is "only negative." Is the definition that "a straight line is the shortest between its extreme points," at all less "negative"? But the question is not whether any definition is negative, but whether it is good; or in other words, whether it obviously distinguishes the thing in question from all other things, and is easily applicable to the determination of consequences.

That "all right angles are equal to one another," is made the subject of a demonstration.

There remains then only the question of Parallel Lines; a subject on which so much has been written, and with so little result, as to make it an act of some danger to advance an opinion upon the point. The objection to the existing state of things is, that the Axiom assumed by Euclid, is one which needs demonstration, in at least as great a degree, for example, as the proposition before alluded to, of the equality of the angles at the base of an isosceles triangle. As in that, it is easy to bring evidence that every man who has tried the experiment has found the rule to answer. But, as in that case also, there is still the query, why. There appears no *primâ facie* reason, why the one proposition should not be as capable of a general demonstration as the other; and if the fact should be, that one of them is *not* capable of such demonstration, this fact alone would be matter of considerable curiosity, to those who have contracted a taste for such inquiries.

The mode in which the solution is sought, is by endeavouring to demonstrate that if at the extremities of any straight line, two perpendiculars are drawn of equal length and towards the same direction (as may be familiarly represented by three sides of a sheet of paper, or any object of similar form), the straight line joining the other ends of these perpendiculars shall make the angles adjacent to it right angles. And the way

* A great advance is attempted on this part of the question, in a subsequent edition (*See Art.* 9 *of West. Rev. for April* 1834, *given in the sequel*), where the generation of the Straight Line and Plane is derived from a property of the Sphere, and this consequence inferred.—*Added in* 1839.

in which this conclusion is pursued, is by trying to demonstrate, first, that if the angles at the base or first side are equal to each other, and greater than right angles, the others must be less; and secondly, that if such angles at the base are less than right angles, the others must be greater.

The demonstration offered of the first of these propositions, is by placing side by side a number of quadrilateral figures equal in all respects to the first, and showing that if their bases are produced, they must successively cut off greater and greater portions of the side of the first or original figure; and consequently, if the number of quadrilateral figures is increased, a time must come when the prolongation of the base of some or other of them, will meet the series of lines formed by the sides of the quadrilateral figures which are opposite to their bases. And as it has been previously established that the side opposite to the base must in each of the quadrilateral figures be parallel to its base, and the angles adjacent to such side be equal to one another;—it follows that these angles cannot be right angles, but must be less. The principle appealed to is the same that was produced by M. Legendre in the 7th edition of his *Eléments de Géométrie*, and withdrawn in consequence of the imperfection of the process by which the remaining step (which, in M. Legendre's case, was that the three angles of a triangle cannot be *less* than two right angles) was attempted to be established.

The procedure for the demonstration of this second part, is by establishing, that if two equal straight lines terminated in the same point, make an angle less than the sum of two right angles, and this be bisected by a straight line of unlimited length which will for distinction be called the *axis;* and at the outward extremity of each of the two equal straight lines be added another straight line equal to the first, and making with it an angle equal to the first-mentioned angle and on the same side of the line,—and so on, lines be added continually; and if the extremities of every two equal straight lines that were added at the same time, be joined by a straight line or *chord;* each of these chords shall make the angles at the two *cusps* or corners where it meets the equal straight lines, equal to one another; and (so long as none of the equal straight lines meets the axis) the several chords shall in succession make greater and greater angles at the cusp, each than the preceding. And the way in which this is proved, is by drawing straight lines from the end of one chord to the end of the next; which shows, almost by inspection, the successive increase of magnitude of the angles at the cusps. A Scholium is added to warn the reader against supposing that the proof that the

angle will continually increase, is any proof that it will attain to a given specified magnitude; a snare into which many of the searchers after a theory of Parallel Lines have notoriously fallen.

The next object of proof, is that *if* in a series of straight lines like the last, the angle at the cusp ever becomes equal to, or greater than, half the angle made by the two first of the equal straight lines, the angular points shall lie in the circumference of a circle, whose centre is in the axis, in the part of it which is cut off by the chord; and the series, being continued, shall at length meet the axis. And this is done by drawing a line from the angular point of the cusp, so as to make with the last of the equal straight lines that was added, an angle equal to half the angle above described; and showing that the point in which this line cuts the axis, must be equidistant from all the angular points.

The next step is, that in a series of straight lines as before, if a straight line of unlimited length both ways, be moved along the axis, keeping ever at right angles to it, such straight line cannot quit or cease to meet the series, without the series having previously met the axis. And this is supported by showing, that when this straight line arrives at any of the cusps, there must always be another pair of straight lines ready for it to pass over, unless in the event of these straight lines having ceased to make an angle with the chord on the side which is towards the axis; and that before this can take place, the angle at the cusp must have been of that magnitude, which has been shown to insure the series meeting the axis.

These preparatory propositions are followed by the final one, that in a quadrilateral figure as before described, if the angles at the base are *less* than right angles, the others are greater. And this is shown by placing a number of the figures in question side by side, prolonging a side of one of the central ones for an axis, and supposing a straight line of unlimited length to move from the vertex along the axis at right angles to it, till it has passed the extremity of the side of the quadrilateral figure which was prolonged to make the axis. If after this it is further moved forward, it must do one of three things; it must either fall in with some of the angular points of the series formed by the bases of the quadrilateral figures, and make an angle at the cusp *less* than one of the angles at those bases; or it must make an angle *greater* than this; or it must never fall in with any of the angular points at all, which can only be in consequence of the series having met the axis. In the first case, it is plain that the angles opposite to the bases are not right angles; for if so, there would be two

straight lines perpendicular to a third straight line, and which yet meet. Still less could the lines in question meet if the angles were *less* than right angles; therefore they are greater. In the second case, it has been shown that the series being continued must meet the axis; and consequently the sides opposite to the bases must form an interior polygon, and meet the axis also. From which it is clear that the angles cannot be right angles, for then the sides would be in one straight line, and two straight lines would inclose a space; and still less could the meeting be effected if the angles were *less* than right angles; therefore they are greater. And the same inferences hold good in the third case; in consequence of its having been proved that in this case also the exterior series must have met the axis. In a note it is attempted to show, that this third case might be dispensed with, by proving that there must be made at least *one* pair of cusps after the moving line has passed beyond the extremity of the side of the quadrilateral figure which was prolonged to make the axis, without the possibility of this being prevented by the series meeting the axis*.

If all this can be established, it is an easy inference that if the angles at the base of the quadrilateral figure are right angles, the angles opposite to the base must be so also. From which it readily follows, that the side opposite to the base is equal to the base. That the angles of any right-angled triangle are equal to two right angles, may be proved by completing the quadrilateral figure. And by drawing a perpendicular to a side that lies between two acute angles, from the angular point opposite, any triangle may be divided into two right-angled triangles; from which it may be inferred that the three angles of any triangle are equal to two right angles. After this, the proposition conveyed in what is commonly called the 12th Axiom, may be proved in the case where one of the angles is a right angle, by taking a point in the line which makes an acute angle with the line that intersects the two others, drawing a perpendicular from this point to the intersecting line, and then constructing ranks of quadrilateral figures which from the previous data it is easy to prove rectan-

* All this may be simplified, by making the "straight line of unlimited length" turn round the extremity of the base of the first of the quadrilateral figures, instead of moving along an axis; and proceeding at once to show that it cannot cease to cut the series, without having previously made an angle at the cusp, large enough to involve the necessity of the angular points lying in the circumference of a circle whose centre can be assigned.

If asked, after the lapse of several years, to state his opinion of the validity of this proof, the writer would say, that without involving any absolute fallacy, it is weak, till somebody can prove, that the intersection of the "straight line of unlimited length" with the series, will always take place *at a finite distance*. Whoever can add this, will have established the theory of parallels.—*Added in* 1839.

gular and equal in all respects, and showing that the line from a point in which the perpendicular was drawn, must coincide with the diagonals of a succession of these rectangular figures, and consequently must at length meet the other line. And when this is proved in the case where one of the angles is a right angle, it is easy to prove the same in the case where neither is a right angle.

If this should happen to be true, it appears to be no reasonable objection to say that it is long. If it can be shortened, till it is as short as the First Proposition of the First Book, it will be well; but if it cannot, it is not a reasonable objection to say that it is long. It would be interesting to know, of any individual geometer, at what precise point he would recommend the introduction of bad reasoning for the sake of brevity. There are, on the common calculation, forty-seven mortal Propositions, before arriving at the demonstration of the square of the hypothenuse? Why should not two-thirds of these be cut down, by an effort of our *royalists* in Geometry?

WESTMINSTER REVIEW. 1 October, 1830.

ART. XVIII.—*Considérations Politiques sur le temps présent.*—Paris, 1830.

THERE is a prodigious difference between the day before a great victory, and the day after. And manifold are the occupations, the interests, the engagements, which start into existence in the first moments of the felicitous decision. Some collect the facts, some crown the victors, some honour the lost, some assist the disabled; or more strictly they do all and each of these at once, to the greatest extent which the nature of things admits. Among all these employments, there is one more, which is not incompatible with any of the rest; and that is, to endeavour to extend the influence of the results,—an occupation peculiarly acceptable to those, who though removed from any direct operation on the scene of action, have laboured for months and years, in the department that was open to them, to clear some roads for *possible* advances, to provide some checks for *possible* efforts of the adversary, and in their remote sphere to organize or to forward some branch and portion of the general aim. All men cannot be every-where; if somebody is to be nearest, somebody must be further off; but it is a pleasant thing to have ridden private gentleman on the right and the victorious side, though the service went no further than cheering on certain individuals to throw their caps up for the good old cause, or helping to have a wounded drum-boy laid snugly in a captain's quarter.

It is done. The Stuarts are beaten over again. Our forefathers are in the right in August; though they were in the wrong in June. The rubbish that we like fools and milksops had allowed to be heaped upon their graves, has all been shovelled away by the *sapeurs* of the National Guard of Paris. It will be long before we are told again in the House of Commons, that it would be absurd for Englishmen to think of resisting tyranny, "*in the existing state of the continent.*" The horn-blowers of arbitrary power in England, have bethought themselves of asking, what the French people have got by their revolution. This is what *we* have got by it; and the French people are probably as well acquainted with their own side of the account.

And what have the French people got; and what is each individual's share? Ask what each Englishman would have got, if the sovereign and form of government supported by the British people had been removed by foreign arms, and supplanted by a race whom every village in England had sacrificed twenty of its children to keep out; and if this worst of sufferings and deepest of misfortunes, had by one heroic effort of the metropolis been cast off, and the intrusive usurpers sent to eat their discreditable bread in foreign lands. Inquire accurately, what portion of satisfaction would have been the particular reversion of each individual Englishman, if, in about the time that a birthday ox takes in roasting, his country had risen from being an object of commiseration to the benevolent and of scorn to the haughty, to set itself at the head of all previously existing combinations of human kind, and stand forth a lode-star and a guide, with brightness that history cannot parallel nor imagination surpass. Fancy a man yesterday nothing, to-day everything. Calculate the difference between bearing about an iron in the soul, and walking in the consciousness of being pursued and pressed upon by the gratitude of human kind. Exhaust all images of such as have lain down in sorrow and risen in joy; and then tell the English absolutist, what each individual Frenchman has gained by his Revolution. *La belle France!* whose men were so gallant, and whose women were so beautiful; and that had suffered so much in the cause of all mankind! If there be gratitude to heaven for raising up some people to be a light and a guide to Europe, there shall be yet a subsidiary thanksgiving, that this people should have been her's.

But this is diverging; but who can help it? The proposal was, to forward the results. And what *are* the results? In England, these. That fifty years of the labour of bad governors to depress and bury the principles of our own Revolution, have

been swept away at a blow; and we, the friends of that Revolution and of all revolutions that the defence of civil liberty makes necessary, are uppermost. Heaven forbid an atom of the honour should be taken from those to whom honour is due. As far as Englishmen were concerned (saving always the exertions of some half-score of our countrymen who fought at Paris) it was pretty nearly an act of God. But here we are. The men who have overwhelmed us with debt to pay for helping despotism in all corners of the earth,—who charged us with the American and French wars, and then told us to look at the continent and see what chance there was of resisting tyranny at home,—the men who made peace only to give us the Corn Laws and the Six Acts, and bestowed on us the last twigs of that birch within twenty-four hours of the deliverance of Paris,—the men who made the Manchester massacre (*military light* has been thrown upon Manchester massacres since then; there will be no more;)—all these are just now rolling in the gulph, like their prototypes of poetry. They are in the condition of the wolf that is taken in a pitfall; who, say the naturalists, is so alarmed, that he may be gone in upon and muzzled, without offering to resist. They know their strength; and we know ours. Nine tenths of the British people are at this moment united in one strong bond of attachment and zeal for the recovered principles of their forefathers, and anxious to prove that they are not unworthy to weave a portion of the same web. They have only to show themselves and to come forward, in all those constitutional ways with which they happily are provided; and their adversaries will surely take advice, —will act like sensible men, and lie down quietly when they *are* down,—and save a great mass of trouble to themselves and everybody. Let them bethink themselves of their own argument,—a Daniel come to judgment!—If the people of England had no physical chance for resistance *then*, what ultimate chance would there be for the refusal of its just claims *now*? But they will be wiser; they will know better than to run needlessly into harm's way. There will always, under the very best state of things, be a modicum of scraps and cheese-parings for Tory man to live by; and they will be contented with what heaven sends them, without attempting to increase it by paying the double of its worth.

This then is the first result to England;—that her people, like the French, have risen in a week from the state of conquest in which they were placed by the unfortunate successes of the Tory arms. They are no longer the *sub jacti*, the thralls of the sword and of the bow, of the Holy Alliance, nor of the English branch of it. They have walked forth, by the blessing of Pro-

vidence and many strange combined interferences, into a state of light and liberty, to which there is nothing comparable in their history, except the change produced by the accession of the other William. What our forefathers were then, we are now. There is no use in being diffuse, in carrying on the parallel.

In this new state of things, the manifest duty and interest of the British people, is to begin, support, and promote every measure, at home and abroad, by which the stamp of final ill success and defeat may most effectually and prominently be put upon the measures of their enemies. It is to do everything, which may help to undo what the others did. To think of staying their hand, because the things to be undone were the deeds of *British* misgovernors and *British* bad ministers, would be as absurd as to have carried on the war with Holland after the disappearance of James the 2nd. It is true that the war had been carried on with English treasure and with English blood; but it is precisely because it had been so carried on and in the teeth of the interests of the English people, that war, if there is to be war, must be on the other side when things have changed. The Jacobites, no doubt, looked back with poignant regret to the times when Englishmen cut the throats of Dutch republicans, and Dutch republicans cut theirs, for the special end and purpose of maintaining a Holy-Alliance pressure upon the liberties of both;—but it would have been a most strange result, if Englishmen, after their liberation from the Holy Alliance influence, had allowed themselves to be misled by appeals to the glories of Dutch wars, and the successes of Holy Alliance battles. If Englishmen loved military glory, there might be glory on the right side, as well as on the wrong; and it was not long before they had a Marlborough, whose glories were as good as any that had preceded. It would have been a most vain and bootless process, that should have tried to stay the progress of events, by getting up dinners to anti-Dutch commanders; and those commanders themselves, would have been weaker men than they were ever taken for, if they had not the genius to put themselves at the head of the new movement, instead of harping upon the old. Russell in the Downs, was as mute as Wellington at Manchester; and where there was no use in grumbling, those were wisest who said least. We are all content, from the throne downwards; with exceptions in about the same proportion, as the white blackbirds and prodigious gooseberries in a country newspaper. The whole game is on our side of the board, king, queen, and all; if the others can produce a bishop or a knight, it is as much as they can show. Everybody is in great good-humour

with everybody; there shall nobody be hurt, only the cause of the people must go forward. If the king wants a yacht, or Her Majesty's Grace would like a few acres of real lace,—a contented people is as well able to pay for them, as a sulky and discontented one. But we must have no Stuarts, here or anywhere. Not a sixpence nor a fathom of rope, to help to declare our own king a usurper, or to set up a Pretender anywhere in opposition to the people's choice. Our own king, for these hundred and forty years, has been legitimate by virtue of his illegitimacy; and three hundred thousand bayonets could be brought, if need were, to prove this to be good law. If anybody is disposed to protest against the inference, will they have the kindness to state with clearness, why a nation with the force in its own hands should not be competent to put down a tyrant, as well as to put down a thief? But, says the tyrant, *I am put down by an appeal to force.* And so is the thief; the community would be in a sad estate, if it might not resort to force, till the thief could be persuaded to sign the warrant. But, again, *I make the law.* Who told you so? You may make it the day before you are beaten, but certainly not the day after. Finally, then, *I ought to* make the law. But Query; why? You *think* you ought; but what if other people think differently? You may have got the true truth; but what if fifty others have got their true truth also, and that a different one. Is there anything that you can do in such a case, but wait till the others are converted? And here the case must rest. Is there anybody that does not see, that the thing called *legitimacy* is a paltry argument in a circle,—fit only for the fool, who tried to climb into the buttery on his own back? —We are *legitimate*, because we *make the law.*—And why are you to *make the law?* Because we are *legitimate.*

There would indeed be another way of putting the argument for legitimacy, which at first sight might seem to contain more of reason; but then its friends will not put the question so, because they know how much the result would finally be against them. And that way would be, to state that such great and undeniable uses have been found in an absolutely unchangeable order of succession, as to swallow up all other reasons, and bind all living creatures to the support of the unvarying rule. But here the misfortune is, that facts and history are against them. No man is disposed to deny, that in countries where there is an absence of the organization for transferring the highest executive power after certain limited periods (which is what makes the principal feature in the form of government known by the title of republican), there is great and decided use in a fixed rule;—that is, in a rule so far fixed, as to be unde-

niably sufficient for regulating the succession under the ordinary circumstance, of a number of individuals who would be all equally happy to take it if they could. But the fact established by history is, that whenever the conduct of this highest executive is so bad, as to force the community to encounter all the suffering attendant on a forced ejection, it is right that the ejection should take place, and that it should extend beyond the actual holder, to all whose claim is but a prolongation of his own. If the holder is barred of succession by the act of the community, all who claim succession through him are barred also; if anybody thinks the contrary, let him try the effect of barring the operation of a common fine, by claiming for the heir at law. The heir is heir to his father's property if he keeps it; but not if the community has taken it away for punishment. A rule which should say that the succession might be barred for crime, but that it could only be to turn it over to the heir,—would be nugatory and fit for idiots; no people have ever been so contracted in their cranial developements, as to think of submitting to it. The English notoriously set their mark upon the folly of it; and the French have not been behind to follow their example. It may not have been entered in a particular book, or engrossed in a certain hand on the skins of a particular kind of beasts;—but it has been written down good national law, in characters more legible than ink and more durable than parchment, for at least these hundred and forty years, to go back no further,—that a sovereign who is weak enough and wicked enough to oblige a people to take the trouble of ejecting him by force, has broken the line of succession for himself and all that claim to hold of him. The necessity of the ejecting power, is simple matter of history. Thirty millions in France are at this moment holding up their hands and declaring to its truth; and though an ultra-royalist may abnegate their right to have anything to say upon the matter, he cannot abnegate the historical fact that they hold up their hands and say so. That it is politic that the succession should be preserved in all but the extreme case,—will never prove that it must be preserved in the extreme case too. It is very meet and right, that a man should walk the streets without being knocked down; but he must be knocked down, if he proceeds to cut his neighbours' throats. The argument is not transferable from the general rule to the exception; and for this plain cause, that the reason which makes the rule, makes the exception too. Men in general must walk the streets in quietness, because it is necessary for the public good it should be so; but a man who tries to cut his neighbours' throats, must be brought to the ground like a mad dog, for the self-same rea-

son, that it is necessary for the public good it should be so. And it makes very little difference whether a man proceeds to cut his neighbours' throats *simpliciter*, or whether he says to them, "You must bottle up your words, your thoughts; you must think as I think, and do as I do; or else here is a line of well-fed able-bodied gentlemen, who shall cut your throats for you in the newest method practised in the army." There will be a difference in the mode of acting in the two cases; a mad dog may be brought to the ground with a butcher's cleaver, or any other of the weapons of suburban war, and the other requires barricades and a more tedious process; but the principle is the same. It is the simple right of self-defence, which men will neither be fooled out of nor frightened out of, that acts in the two cases alike. If it should be said that men have a mania, a *pruritus*, for ejecting sovereigns,—it might be asserted with as much show of truth, that they have a mania for having a leg cut off in St. Bartholomew's Hospital. The process of ejection, in one case as in the other, is a troublesome process, an awful process, which men never undertake nor dream of undertaking, but under the heavy pressure of keen necessity. The fallacy that says the contrary, is one that only shows itself in company, for want of men's looking for the cloven foot.

The English people are on the side of the French Revolution, because they have the legitimacy of their own sovereign to defend, and because they have no intention of seeing anybody remove the sentries from the Horse Guards, and send for the King of Sardinia. Those who are of this opinion say Aye; those who are of the contrary opinion say No, and let us see how many they are. If an attempt should be made to decry the analogy between the Revolutions, it will only end in showing that the French was the better of the two. There was the very awkward circumstance about the English one, that it was undeniably brought about in part, by the help of certain regiments of Dutch Guards. If the French people had called in the Swiss instead of the king, their revolution would have been where ours was; and the Swiss regiments added to the Dutch, give the difference by which the French revolution was better than the English.

It appears to be decided that there is to be no direct attempt on the part of the arbitrary sovereigns, to put down the contagion of English principles; for English they may be called, by right of seniority, though there is no denying that their resuscitation in France has been attended with a splendour vastly surpassing anything that took place in England. The English

revolution was, as somebody has rightly observed, useful but not glorious. It was a tame affair, as far as related to external effect; but it had one great good quality, it was permanent. It may perhaps be at some time gone beyond, and so may a mile-stone; but like a mile-stone, it will not retrograde, but remain a mark by which future generations will calculate their progress.

The further directions in which every person must feel anxious to attempt some calculation of the results, are in its effects on France, and on the rest of the continent of Europe. Is the revolution ended in France? Clearly not. It is where a man is, when he gets up in the morning and has his day's work before him. But there is a right way of doing this day's work, and a wrong; and it is a great blessing to be in the way of starting fair for a beginning. France has thrown off the foreign conquest; for herself and England too. Men on the two sides of the Channel stand up free; and the Cossack spear can no longer be held out *in terrorem*, at Manchester, or at Paris. But Frenchmen have got one more great advantage; they have the arms in their own hands, and the world may rest persuaded, that they will not be induced to give them up. They will not be led away by the English journalists who prove, that the only way to be safe, is to subscribe for gunpowder for blowing out our own brains, with *item* for the keep of a man to light the same. They have got the power, and they will keep it; there is no doubt therefore that in the end, they will have everything their own way. The only question is, whether they will go quietly about the operation, or not quietly. And here it by no means follows, that because men have arms in their hands, they must attempt to perform everything by force of arms. Englishmen have weapons of no mean power, attached by nature to their brachial extremities; and yet they forego the temptation of legislating through the medium of pugilistic combats, because they know there are other ways equally effectual and which save a large amount of bloody noses in the process. What holds good of these weapons, would hold of more dangerous ones; in fact the premium would only be the greater, on paying deferential awe to the inventions of voting and election. There is therefore no inherent reason, why a nation with arms in its hands, should not agree to settle its affairs by the innoxious processes of ballot and petition; the contrary assertion is only the Tory jingle, about "an armed nation being governed like an army." What is to be desired, at least on this side the water, is, that if the French community is not content, petitions may be seen pouring in to the seat of government, of which one end shall be within the barriers, and the other at Lyons or Bordeaux. If *these* produce no effect, it might be time to think of

further operations; but *till* then, the subject seems to be premature. It is very well known that an English ministry cannot stand against shot of this kind; and it is hard to conceive, that in the existing state of things, a French one should have any armour that can turn it. No ministries are good for anything, intrinsically; there never was a good one, nor ever will be. They all do precisely what they cannot help; and provided there is but the impulsive force to drive, one is very little better than another. It would be sad waste of time, if the French people were to wait till they got a good ministry. These are among the things—and there are some—which are better understood in England. Nobody here waits for a good ministry; the worst will do our business, *if we can only make it.* The French people will be to blame if they burn as much gunpowder as would scare a rookery, in the course of obtaining everything which they can agree among themselves to wish for. There is no doubt that the process must go a long way. Other nations, and Englishmen in particular, look to them for a practical declaration, that all the acts of a government established by foreign force are *non avenus* and of no avail, except so far as the legitimate government shall see a fitness in confirming the existing state of things. There must not be a man of the ancient army, who does not find himself, to the extent of what human talent can devise, in the self-same rank and place that he would have occupied at this day, if he had never been ousted by the appointees of the foreigner. There must be nobody led to battle by men who carry the colours of the enemy in their pockets, and wait only for an opportunity of sacrificing their followers. There must be a huge extension of the right of suffrage, and a withdrawing of all pretended apprehensions that the represented shall chuse a man too young or too old to guard their interests. All priests who will not sing the *salvum fac* to any substantive the community may chuse to add to it, must be sent to teach French at English boarding-schools. That all these things and many more must be done in the end, no man will be found to doubt; but there is no occasion to mar the whole by hurry. The *recognitions* are at this moment hardly clear of the shell; and there is scarcely any of the changes that are to be, that would not have served the enemies of France and England for a splendid plea to hang a refusal of recognition on, if it had come a week too soon. It is clear enough, that the intense feelings of a nation cannot be hushed into repose before the cold demonstrations of policy; but still, when it is proved that great advantage has arisen already from a particular course, there

must be somewhere a class of minds, on whom the argument will not be urged without effect.

But though there may be reasons to check impatience, it does not follow that men are to put up patiently with the final loss of what they ought to have. A people who have just thrown off the effects of foreign conquest by force of arms, are neither to be deceived nor trifled with. There are many facts, or more properly *non-facts*, for which it is exceedingly difficult to assign any just cause. For example, when it is notorious that an extensive portion of the French electors were deprived of their suffrages within a few years by the act of the foreign government,—what living man can give a just reason for eight or nine weeks having past, and nothing done towards undoing this youngest-born of foreign domination? Or when the same agents of the foreigner on their first arrival promised to remove certain taxes peculiarly odious to the community, and of course never did it,—that nothing effectual should have been performed towards meeting the complaints of the community on this point? Or more ominous still, that nothing should have been done to satisfy the just anxiety of the public, to know how long it is to be before a Chamber elected under the guns of the foreign despots, is to be replaced by a national one? Inferences from one country to another may be liable to mistake; but it is inconceivable to Englishmen, that if they were in the act of a recovery like that of France, a Chamber of such a kind could last one week, after the cessation of the palpable necessity for using it for an instrument of temporary regulation. They are utterly at a loss how it can be, that either such a Chamber, if it has no popular members within its walls, should not be dissolved by the loud and unanimous display of public opinion; or that its popular members, if there are any, should not establish for themselves a right to the renewed support of their constituents, by raising an irresistible voice for it themselves. Something must be done on these points within a few weeks; or we shall have more arrivals at our *ménagerie* in England. The French ministers would appear to be a sort of Whigs; which means men whose object is to do the most they can for themselves, through the medium of doing the least they can for the community. Nevertheless when a community has got so much real power as the French, it is the fault of the community if everything is not done which it desires. Under the pressure of such a force, the ministry must either bend or break. A ministry which has not yet thought of taking off the latest shackles laid on by the lieutenants of the foreign powers, can be no object of commiseration, whatever may befall it.

The effects of the young Revolution on the rest of the world, are easy enough to calculate in the gross; though it would be labour thrown away to attempt to follow them in detail. As in the Roman epigram *, "*Dum radis, altera barba subit.*" It is the *débâcle* come at last. It is the breaking up of the great frost. There may be a few weeks difference between its operation in one place and in another; but it will reach all in the end. The people every-where know that their cause is won; that their enemies are defeated, disgraced, and made ridiculous; and that they have only to sit still like passengers after a storm, and wait till a convenient plank is put out for them to land in the haven where they would be. Spain and Portugal are militarily cut off; every day's delay in those quarters, is only so much more security for things being done effectually and well. Belgium is a sore point; but it will all be well a twelvemonth hence. If the population of Belgium should be obliged to succumb for the present, any attempt of the victors to go beyond the moderation of the victorious party in Paris, would be the signal for free Europe to present itself within the Belgian frontiers. The Dutchmen will not be too officious. They have money-bags that will be bail for their not doing anything it would be unpleasant to remember, if there should be a good skating-season in the winter that approaches. If they hurt a single Belgian, he shall be charged in the bill when the time comes. The world is looking out for somebody to read a moral lesson on; and the unfortunate Dutchmen will be ground to powder, if they put themselves in the way of the great machine. If they trust to English agents, —was there ever anybody that trusted to English agents, and was not deceived? The English minister is on the point of being driven to take refuge in the popular ranks if he means to preserve his ministerial existence; and he will not ask the English people to go to war, for the sake of keeping his aides-de-camp on thrones. Any apprehension of interference from the English Tories, is irrational. They have no way of interfering, but by dispatching a force; and they will take advice before they determine upon that. It would perhaps be in the end one of the happiest events, that they should try; for the soldiery would return with their heads full of Belgian girls and Belgian principles, and the last state of those Tories would be worse than the first. There are reports of the appearance of mental reservation in the recognitions from some of the continental powers. If so, the apparition of a *corps d armée* under the tricoloured flag towards the Rhine, and another towards Italy with the addition of such Spanish and Portuguese battalions

* On a bad barber.—"*While you are shaving, a new beard grows.*"

as in a few weeks may be conveniently forthcoming, would be very likely to act as what Dr. Kitchener was wont to entitle a *persuader*. If Russia makes difficulties, she will be answered in one word, "Poland." Her Northern and Southern provinces are ripe for a division, the spirit of change is in her armies and among her people, and there is scarcely a family of eminence that has not some relative in exile for opposition to the existing form of government. Under such circumstances, it needs no gift of prophecy to know, how little able Russia would be to oppose the contingents of civilized Europe, marching upon Poland with a demand that Russia should give up everything she has taken by force or fraud for the last half century. To such a consummation, if rendered necessary, the people of England would contribute with ardour and delight; for though they are far from being pre-eminent for insight into causes and effects, they are quite able to understand, how Russia in times past has been the hammer their own oppressors brought in for the purpose of riveting their chains. Russia, then, is on her good behaviour. It appears to be determined that no original movement shall be made against her. But if she chuses to be chivalrous, the shoes are made and fitted, that will carry the representatives of Western Europe to a congress of human kind at Warsaw. And why not? When Russia sent to the Spaniards to say they should not have a constitution, was there any bargain that Europe should not assist the Spaniards to send to Russia, to say she shall not have Poland?

Two things may be understood as having mainly contributed to the submission with which the despotisms of Europe have received the new Revolution in France. One is, the consciousness that their own people and armies are on the side of the French. And the other is, the recollection of the military system bequeathed to Europe by Napoleon. If the Western states of Europe are united and in earnest, and if they have only to cope with the regular armies of the great despotic powers while the people subject to those powers are either neutral or in concealed hostility to their masters,—it is established both by theory and experiment, that the civilized races have the good military position against their adversaries, and have little to do but chuse, in whose capital they will first request an arrangement of disputes. These two causes in conjunction, are sufficient to account for almost any degree of inoperativeness on the part of the despotic governments. They see clearly that their power is departed from them, and given to the people, whom they trampled on. There is a new Holy Alliance, in which they are the wolves; but the wolves, this time, who are to be muzzled and controlled.

A reasonable object of curiosity, at least in Great Britain, is to know what precise degree of connexion existed between the *ci-devants* of France, and the British cabinet as it stood at the period immediately preceding the change. The subject would have better suited a preceding Article*; and ought, but for a misapprehension, to have appeared under the same authority with other facts connected with the events of Paris.

The British ministry was *not* a party to the Ordonnances in France; saving only the possibility of a personal understanding between individuals, which as being impossible to prove or disprove, ought not to be admitted on presumption. The connexion was *on another point*;—Greece. The British ministry received the nomination of Polignac with delight; because on this subject it found him an ally. The cause of Greece was hateful to the Tory aristocracy; and the cause of Turkey proportionably dear. The previous French ministry had on this point been in the highest degree intractable. It had urged the importance of making Greece, not Turkey, the barrier against Russia; and it was not till the accession of the Polignac ministry, that the communications between the two cabinets went on with ordinary smoothness. But neither was Polignac the author of the celebrated Ordonnances; they originated with the individual now dethroned, under the guidance of the spiritual power. A debauchee in early life, he had the usual anxiety of ancient debauchees, to enter heaven under the lappets of the church; and the church displayed its usual anxiety, to make its earthly market by an ancient debauchee. The light, too, thrown on the character of George the Fourth by the memories preserved of him in France, is by no means favourable. In his latter days, he was an admirer of despots and of despotism. His mind had become right legitimate; the freedom of the press was gall and wormwood to him; and the sentiments which he expressed on foreign questions, would have been less misplaced in the mouth of a continental *roitelet*, than of the splendid representative of the sovereignty of the British people as expressed in the establishment and maintenance of the Brunswick line. On the whole there have probably been few events in the personal history of kings, which have produced a more marked effect on human happiness, than the accession of the existing sovereign to the British throne.

One word to the abettors of arbitrary power in England. Let them keep a clean tongue on the subject of republicanism. To hear them, it might be supposed that republicanism was some strange vice; instead of being, like heaven, a state to

* On the *Events of the Three Days in Paris*. By Dr. Bowring.

which no objection can be found except the fear that we are not good enough for it ourselves. There is no policy in keeping up this contest, in a balanced government like ours. If one side will hold its peace, the other might.

Postscript. 30 Sept. 1830.

(From a Republication in the form of a Pamphlet.)

The above Article was in a state which did not admit of alteration later than the 26th of September. This information may be necessary to account for what has been said, and what has not.

Since that period, has been received the confirmation of the treacherous advance of the Dutch troops on Brussells, with the glorious news of the successful resistance of the gallant Belgians.

The liberties of Europe have been conquered over again at Brussells.

Two citizens of Brussells, a civilian of high character in the peaceful profession of the law, and the editor of the newspaper called *Le Courrier des Pays Bas*, have been carried off from under the protection of a flag of truce, in the act of negotiating for the prevention of bloodshed; and remain in the hands of the assassins of their countrymen. The Arab of the desert respects a flag of truce; there is only one class of individuals in Europe, that does not.

Look at the Bourbons convoyed in safety through the country they had filled with mourning. Then look at these citizens of Brussells, carried off from under the symbol of negotiation, which the rudest soldier, with the exception made above, is in the habit of respecting; and ask why continental Europe should not rise, to abate the grand nuisance, to put down the class which owns no laws, and whose members toil and labour to prove their existence incompatible with the safety of mankind.

It is painful to shed blood. The veteran judge weeps when he condemns a murderer. But the case is altered, when the threat of punishment has been previously held out in the individual instance *, as the means of preventing slaughter. The man who in this case declines to act, is not a philanthropist, but an accomplice. In no age have the people had any justice done them, but through the fear of *reprisals* †. If the Belgians announce, that should any harm be done to Messrs. Ducpétiaux and Evrard, the first *four* members of any continental sovereign family that shall be taken in a contest with the people shall suffer personal reprisals, every nation in Europe will be eager to back the warrant.

* Canada.—*Author, in* 1839. † Canada.—*Author, in* 1839.

It has been insinuated on this occasion also, that British agents have been concerned. It ought not to be believed without proof. The British ministry has given no evidence of such incapacity, as would be implied in prompting the king of Holland to his present course, when it was plain that in the event of failure, France might agree to take Belgium, and Prussia Holland, without the remotest chance of effectual resistance from any power in Europe;—and least of all from England, where the consequence must be to endanger Hanover, which the British government values, and the British people does not. The English minister must be "*mad*" twice over, who should think at the present moment, of asking the country to support him in an interference, the result of which was to be a war for the recovery of Hanover. Will he ask us to subscribe to assist the violators of the English girls at Brussells?—*C'est ainsi qu'on arrange nos femmes!* * Compare this with the conduct of the people at Paris; and see the difference there is between the people having the upper hand, and Royal troops.

The British people every-where are called upon for a legal and constitutional expression of their sentiments on the great events in Belgium. The Irish Catholics are called upon by name, to express their feelings on a subject where the analogy to their own circumstances is complete, even to the colour of a cockade;—the portion of the English Protestants that stood by them at the decision of their own question, has a right to ask for it.

Kings are made to rule, under a compact with the people; but not to massacre and fire upon the people. No man is safe in his house, till it is made the common law of Europe, that the prince who fires upon the people, *has ceased to reign.*

Programme to the Westminster Review for 1 Jan. 1831.

IN the last three months there has been a large preponderance of good, but with some negative quantities in the mass. For instance, nobody thought the Belgians would have been busy still, in hunting for a wolf to keep their sheep. But nations, like men, must have time to come to years of discretion in. In the Peninsula too, there has been disappointment; but better things will probably show themselves *avec la violette.* The English Revolution is begun; for what can be a greater revo-

* "*This is the way they serve our women!*" The first person who fell by the fire of the Royal Guards at Paris was a woman. A gigantic baker's journeyman threw her over his shoulder, the blood streaming down his white clothes, and ran with her to the *Palais Royal,* where he flung her down among the crowd, with this exclamation.

lution than to see a government that promises reform,—excepting always a government that executes it. Meanwhile, wise men wait; ordinary people hope; and fools expect. For all that we shall receive, may heaven make us thankful.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 January, 1831.

ART. I.—1. *Constitutional Code for the use of all nations professing liberal opinions. Chap. X. Defensive Force.* By Jeremy Bentham, Esq.—8vo. Heward. 1830.

2. *Bataille de Paris.* Par le lieutenant-général Allix.—Paris. 1830.

3. *Military Events of the late French Revolution.* By an Officer of the *Garde Royale.* From the French.—Murray. 1830.

4. *La Liberté reconquise.*—Paris. 1830.

5. *Evénemens de Bruxelles.*—Brussells. 1830.

OF the treatise at the head of this list, there would be difficulty in determining whether it is most remarkable, that it should have been printed *before* the events of last July, or that it should have been kept under a bushel *after*. To drag it from its unjust, and indeed unscriptural, hiding-place, and to garnish it with such small fry of ephemeral productions as may illustrate its importance and extend its effects, will be the object of the Article that follows.

A military force has always been a mystery. It was a thing that a nation ought to have, and ought not to have. When the public is in bodily fear,—as, for instance, when its sleep is disturbed by the apprehension of gun-boats in the Channel, or the dread of waking with its capacious throat cut from ear to ear by internal insurrection,—then a military force, like Edie Ochiltree in the novel, is cockered up as something exceedingly worthy to be praised. But when the fit of fear is over, it is found out (as may be true enough) that the guest is what most people could do without, and at best but a dangerous kind of vagrant in masquerade, viewed every-where with suspicion not unmingled with dislike.

In this state of things it was matter of no ordinary interest, to his own country and the world, to see a great publicist step forward to take the dilemma by the horns. But the importance was incalculably enhanced, by the unparalleled conjuncture under which the circumstance took place. It is manifest that, or ever the violet had blossomed, or the vine put forth her tender grapes, a vision had fallen upon the seer, and a sight upon the aged, and he had seen—not a he-goat that pushed northward and southward, nor a ram that pushed eastward and westward—but two millions of National Guards marching to

the sound of the Marseillaise, and all nations, and languages, and tongues, applauding in their train. In brief, he had beheld a free people in the *paulò post futurum;* and he indited it in a book, and caused it to be engraven as on a rock, that they that come after may read, and the bands of the oppressed be loosed.

If a disinterested spectator were asked to what single circumstance in the history of the existing European generation he would attribute the greatest mass of human suffering,—the longest list of broken bones, and they are evils, and broken hearts, and they are greater,—the largest crop of hopes destroyed and expectations trampled on, of cities ruined and families dishonoured,—the heaviest freights of worldly happiness wrecked and scattered, to gratify the appetites of the smallest number and those the most unworthy,—the result could hardly fail to be, that next after the existence of the great Moloch in whose name and to whose honour these sacrifices have been made, he would ascribe it to the preponderating physical force which has been concentrated in the hands of regular or stipendiary armies. From which conclusion the step would be a small one to the next,—that in proportion as the force of regular armies has been neutralized and kept in check by either the actual or virtual operation of a superior strength in the hands of the rest of the community, has been the degree of safety, honour, freedom and all other good things, which has fallen to the share of those in whom is the real fee simple of the interests of the society. In so much that the *ratio* between one of these forces and the other, (under certain limitations through the necessity for some positive quantity of that from which danger arises), may be considered as the measure of all public good, so far as the same is dependent on the just regulation of the physical powers existing within a given political community. And if the countries in which this ratio is the greatest, may be considered as occupying the highest places in the scale of human improvement,—it seems to follow that one in which the proportion should be none at all, (as would be the consequence of the removal of all counterbalance, or in other words the disarming of the mass of the community), would present the *zero* or lowest depth, to which all other nations might refer, in calculating their rates of comparative degradation.

As intimated above, the dangerous force cannot be entirely removed. If it were removed tomorrow, it would only be to remake it, or something equivalent, the day after. Whether the case may be altered at some future period, it is not easy absolutely to determine; though there may be many reasons

to suppose it will. When mankind shall have further emerged from the mists in which they have been born, and which they have been taught to take for light;—when new phases shall have been witnessed of the grand process by which man has been raised from a grovelling barbarian to his present degree of partial information and improvement;—when something like reasonable governments shall have been established throughout the influential masses of the human family, and it shall have been generally discovered, first, that government has an object, and secondly, that the way to obtain this object is to go the way that leads to it and not the opposite;—when men shall have admitted, and shall have ceased to persecute one another for believing, that common sense and reason may be applied to the direction of a government as of a line-of-battle ship, and that something may be done better than letting it drift before the wind, or than committing it and all on board to the arbitrary direction of an hereditary pilot;—when they shall have found out the gross folly, the profound blunders, the desperate inanity, and the low fraud, of all or most of the pretexts on which wars have been habitually waged and contests erected;—when they shall have thoroughly convinced themselves that nine-tenths of these disputes, and ninety-nine hundredths of the remainder, were begun, carried on, and prolonged, with no veritable object but that of finding *keep* ("prevent," as Captain Dalgetty has it) for a certain few out of the purses of the rest, and that the war-cries brought to aid have been so many clumsy frauds, in which "patriotism" meant "Open us your pockets," and "courage" meant "Throw yourselves under our Jaggernaut upon the signal;"—when they shall have been penetrated and soaked with the persuasion, that wars have always been *hoaxes* on one side and generally on two, and that, notably, the longest and heaviest with which our own countrymen have any personal acquaintance, were founded on nothing but the resolution of one description of persons, that not a shilling in the hands of the industrious classes should remain unspent, as long as it could be expended with the prospect of securing the power of taking another shilling for themselves;—when nations shall have compared notes, and have found out, in the words of the old presbyterian colonel who fell at Preston Pans, how "shamefully and scandalously they have been befooled;"—it would be hard indeed, if some progress was not made towards diminishing the demand for arms and men to carry them, and reducing the magnitude of the perilous element in the compound of the public safety. As sure as sheep are bred in Leicestershire with little heads, the fools of the next generation will be smaller fools than the

fools of the present. There will be an awful reckoning for the wisdom of ancestors, when *ours* is grown old enough to come under that predicament; and it would be fearful folly to measure the imbecility of future generations by the standard of our own.

It is conceded however, that for the present at least, somebody must be kept to fight. If, then, men are to fight, whom are they to fight? secondly, whom are they *not* to fight? Certainly not those who pay for them. But if the fighters are set to do it, how can it be helped? Only as men help themselves against those who rob on the highway;—by waiting till they can get rid of it, and no longer. And how can it be got rid of? Heaven knows. But there is an easy way to keep it down, if ever it *should* be down; and that is, to keep a stronger force of honest men. If indeed the public could be persuaded to say to the rogues, "O rogues, rule us. We beg you to eat "of our meat, and drink of our beer; and thus shall you be "fat and well-liking, to fire upon us when there shall be occa- "sion. Above all things visit us, we pray you, and see that "we have no arms; for so might we be tempted, and your pur- "pose concerning us fail. We are poor rascals, and wish to be "poorer; our daughters also are exceedingly at your service, "whenever you may please to require them. We know, and have "been told by authority, that such things are the necessary conse- "quence of your coming among us; God forbid that we should "blame you for a necessary consequence."—If there was any chance of finding a community with brains of calf and hearts of hound to speak in this manner, the vocation of the spoilers might last for a time that has no limit. But then everybody knows that the chance is nothing. It is only in matters included within the magic sound of "politics," that men can be persuaded to lay aside their wits. No man is bound to be an ass, except upon public account. Neither the squirehood nor the priesthood can persuade anybody to prop open his gates, that the pigs may run into his potato-field. It is only when the thing is to be done on a national scale, that they can persuade men to pay both for the props and for the herd of swine.

Such is the state of things as it ought not to be; next, for the state as it ought to be. The object then, one, to wit *National Defence;* against enemies from *without* and *within;* neither against enemies from without to the exclusion of those who are within, nor the converse, but against both; by *land* and by *water; abroad* and at *home.* For which object, branches two; the Radical [fearful word], and the Stipendiary. Stipendiary to fight for Radical; and Radical to frighten Stipendiary. "Of the Radical force the members naturally unpaid;"—

a poor invention, what can there be got by that? The Stipendiary, as the name imports, paid; which undoes the mischief, by taking money from one person and giving it to another, which is what political economists call "putting money in motion." Nevertheless it may be doubted whether it be enough to undo it altogether; for

'Of the land-service force, the Stipendiary portion is but as a twig growing out of, and nourished by, the Radical branch. Though in respect of its quantity capable of being augmented, and but too liable and apt to be augmented to excess, the existence of it is the result and evidence of a considerable progress made in the career of civilization; forasmuch as thus, by means of a comparatively small portion withdrawn from the care of producing the matter of subsistence and abundance, the whole remainder of the population is left free, without obstruction, to employ itself exclusively in maximizing the aggregate mass of the matter on which life and prosperity depend.'—*p.* 3.

The object of government is not to maximize the aggregate mass of the matter on which life and prosperity depend; but to maximize the matter on which the prosperity of the governors depends. If this was not so, nobody would be a governor; and consequently there would be anarchy. With this exception the passage is probably correct.

'But while the number of them is thus comparatively small, their power of exerting force with effect,—and this for the purpose not only of defence, but of offence likewise,—will, in equal numbers, be comparatively great. And it being necessary not only for the actual exercise of their appropriate functions, but also for the putting and keeping them at all times in a state of preparation for it, that they should be kept together in bodies more or less numerous: hence it is, that they are at once a source of security on one account, and of danger on another.'—*p.* 6.

'In the stipendiaries belonging to the sea-service branch, no such source of danger is perceptible. The element on which they act keeps them in a state of comparative separatedness; and at the same time mostly at an uninfluential distance from the seat of the legislature.' —*p.* 7.

The process of obtaining the greatest good, is therefore reduced to the following rules:—

'Rule 1. Minimize the stipendiary force, so far as is consistent with security against hostility from without.'

'Rule 2. Maximize the radical force,—to wit, so far as is consistent with the non-employment of compulsory means for the formation or maintenance of it.'—*p.* 21.

If prophecy means speaking of a thing beforehand, this was undoubtedly the National Guard by prophecy.

The "Reasons" also contain much in brief. To begin with the diminution of the Stipendiary:—

'*Reasons.*—1. Minimization of danger to the constitution from insubordination on the part of these functionaries, and from resistance to, and even forced ascendancy over, their respective superordinate authorities, whether in the military line or the non-military; to wit, the army minister, the navy minister, the prime minister, and the legislature.

2. Minimization of expense,—of the quantity of the expense bestowed upon the service of this compound sub-department.

3. Minimization of power and disposition, on the part of the government, to engage in offensive aggression against other States, and thence to involve this State in needless and internally pernicious warfare.

Reasons for the maximization of the Radical:

1. Maximization of security, and sense of security, against danger of insubordination and ascendancy on the part of the stipendiary force.

2. Giving increase to the chance and facility of affording, without expense of bounty or enlistment, or at less expense, as well as without compulsion, increase in case of need, to the stipendiary force.'—*p.* 21.

As some persons have declared the style of the author to be to their apprehension occasionally peregrine and difficult, it may be useful to remark that "maximize" means "have the most you can of," and "minimize" means "have as little as you can of."

The above is the great discovery of the book; which, though like Columbus's egg, it is easy to say it was within everybody's knowledge when they are told,—yet leaves the question, of why people have been so long in making any practical employment of it.

These extracts are from the Sections entitled *Branches, what,* and *Leading Principles.* The next are from that surnamed *Radicals, who.* To which the answer is, not that they are all who drink Roasted Corn, or attend the meetings at the Rotunda, or wear tricoloured cockades, or beat the New Police when they catch them in small quantities; but that

'Exceptions excepted, to the Radical branch of the Defensive Force will belong, at all times, all who, being apt with respect to the performance of the appropriate exercise, are willing to join therein; none who are not willing. Appropriate denomination, accordingly, *volunteers.*'—*p.* 32.

It will present itself at once as an objection to this plan, that it can be used only in very limited circumstances. It contains no provision for the interest of any but the community; it is applicable, therefore, under none but popular governments. Con-

sider, for example, what the consequences would be in England, if every individual who was "willing to join therein," had a musquet of forty inches barrel, and ammunition hanging by it in a pouch. In six months there would not be an abuse a man could live by. The mine of wealth which consists in the power of appropriating the public money, would be ruined and dried up; and the consequences would creep downwards into all classes of society, ramifying themselves like a plague, and preying on the wholesome frame of social order like a leprosy. If the rich were impoverished, it is clear the poor would starve; for it is the rich that feed the poor and not the poor the rich. The aristocracy and higher classes would be reduced to the state in which they are found "in a neighbouring country," of being obliged to keep their children instead of feeding them out of the public purse. Wealth would lose its best reward, which is the power of taking other people's; and industry its surest recompense, which is the certainty of being allowed to continue its toils. To aver that such a plan would answer under better circumstances, is Utopian; that is to say, it belongs to an ideal state of things, where tubs shall be made with bottoms, and every cat have claws. Whatever is not present, can only be seen in vision, therefore it is visionary; and everything is wild, which any man would be mad to expect. The whole *dyslogistic* vocabulary of statesmen, may be poured out upon a scheme so unlicked and barbarous, as that of giving arms to "all who are willing to join therein." There would be no amusement in the world, after such a consummation as this. There would be nothing in it worth taking;—that is to say, that could be taken. Instead of every man's *house* being his castle, every man's purse would be his castle; which would have much more serious effects on the existing order of things. Society would be one collection of unmanageable men, too strong to be robbed, and too self-willed to be muzzled. Chaos would come again, and the earth be without form and void; till at last the survivors would cast lots for a Royal Guard to fire on the remainder, and club their last sixpences to hire Swiss regiments in aid.

'The legislature will not, it is supposed, look for Radicals in the character of volunteers elsewhere than in towns of considerable size, and in the near neighbourhood of such towns. Reasons: avoidance of the expense in labour and money, of journeys to and from the place of exercise.—Principle, the expense-minimizing.'—*p.* 35.

No imperative reason appears, why an insulated Radical might not usefully exercise himself in learning to hit "six feet by two" at a hundred and eighty yards, against his own hill side if he has one in his neighbourhood. But the legislature, as is

properly observed, would not expect it of him if it was accompanied with any extraordinary degree of personal fatigue.

'To qualify the great body of the members of the radical force for attaining the ends of the institution, two sets of directing functionaries will be necessary: *commanders* and appropriate *instructors*. The instructors being but assistants to the commanders, will naturally act as such under their direction; as in private life, instructors in the several branches of art and science act under the direction of parents and guardians, their employers. Principle, the aptitude-maximizing.'

'In the case of the privates, service in this line being purely voluntary, the natural course of things is that, in them, that is to say in the majority of them, should be the choice of both commanders and instructors; for unless in this choice a vote were allowed to him, many a man whose service would have been useful, might decline to serve. Principles, 1. The Aptitude-maximizing. 2. The Number maximizing. 3. The Contentment-maximizing. 4. The Inequality-minimizing.' —*p.* 49.

This mode of recommending for commissions, is a cold prospect for the higher orders. In fact an inattention to their interests, is one of the defects with which the author is most liable to be charged.

The next Section is headed *Stipendiaries, who.*

'A Stipendiary is every person, who, having by authority of government, as per Art. 2, been *located* in any part of the aggregate corps composed of stipendiary defensive force functionaries, has not been, as per Art. 3, *dislocated* out of it.'—*p.* 51.

On the nature of these functionaries more light is thrown in a following paragraph, where they are divided into such as serve by land on foot, armed with fire-arms and bayonets; who are subdivided again into infantry of the line, intended to act in close order, and for the most part in close combat, which the ancients were wont to call ἐγχειμάχεσθαι, *cominus*,—and light infantry, or say riflemen, destined to act by their dispersed force, and for the most part at a distance, which the Romans entitled *eminus*. Likewise those who serve on horseback; of whom some are Heavy Horse, or as we say in French *Cavalerie d'élite;* and those who are not Heavy, are Light. Also Horse Artillery, including Rockets,—to which last, little that is analogous can be found in antiquity, excepting the thunder and lightning which certain Indians did lance at Bacchus, in the first and last campaign he made in those parts. Nor is the story so devoid of likelihood, as may at first appear. For though some have thought that Bacchus was Noah, because he is the first whose drinking is commemorated, and others that he was Moses, because he had horns, which Michael Angelo

also has represented in his figure of the latter; it is exceedingly probable that he was neither the one nor the other, but some hard-drinking soldado who penetrated into India, as many others have done since; neither is it any way incredible, that such a person should have horns, at least in a figurative sense, which is enough for the explanation of history, especially of ancient dates, it having, as is well known, been the custom of those times to speak much in metaphors and types, so that the account must not be construed too literally, and there may have been many circumstances leading to a full understanding, which as the ancients would express it, *prae vetustate deperierunt.* And of the functionaries there are also that serve amphibiously (ἀμφὶ and βίος) on foot or horseback; which are called Dragoons. *Query*, may not posterity conclude from this, that the Horse-Guards Blue lived always in their saddles? They also which serve for attack or defence of fortified places, are manifold; as Military Engineers, Artillery-men including such as handle rockets, Miners, Sappers, Military Artificers, Pontooneers (for making bridges by boats and otherwise). Finally, those who may be held to be the veritable *amphibes*, or such as serve amphibiously by land or sea, videlicet Marines; to whom by reason, as would appear, of the jollity of their occupation, the vulgar do ordinarily attach an epithet indicative of the same. These are the species enumerated by the author; but the learned have distinguished others, as the grenadier, whose function was to throw a hollow ball filled with gunpowder, entitled a grenade; which is undoubtedly from *granata* a pomegranate, the grains of powder lying inside and the hard shell upon the out, in the same order as in that fruit. Also the fusileer, who was in old time armed with a weapon lighter than the rest; which some call harquebuss. But as there is no limit to the number of ways in which men may be slain, so there is none to the number of functions which may arise out of the same; on which account it may be considered infinite, or as the mathematicians more correctly express it, greater than any quantity that may be assigned.

"Officers are distinguished into—1. Ordinary; 2. Erudite, or say Select."—*p.* 56. In which it is not meant to affirm, that there are a great many very ordinary officers; but by "Ordinary" are shown to be intended, first, *corporals*, secondly *serjeants*, while the "Erudites" begin at the rank of *ensign*, which is sometimes styled *second lieutenant*, and in the horse *cornet*. It will be plain that this is not taken from the existing state of things, for there are as yet many ensigns who are not erudite; but is rather to be considered as pointing to some state which

in the mind of the author was commendable and to be desired. Neither are all fictive representations of this kind to be too absolutely blamed; for they may usefully set forth that which is desirable, though it may never be entirely compassed and obtained. Thus the book of Longinus Περὶ Ὕψους, or On the Sublime, was written to assist men in their endeavours after that mode of writing; but is not culpable because all who read it have not yet arrived at the mark. So that even though it could be proved that ensigns would never be erudite within the lives of the present generation, no blame can be attached to the having set forth, that it were well they should be, or at all events should be put into the way of being.

In addition to this claim that they shall be erudite or in the way of being so, the prospect for ensigns of good family is in other manners rendered dark and unpropitious. For example, few of them will look over the following quotation, without seeing in it something of sinister and sad.

'ART 31.—OFFICERS. Mode of location. Exceptions excepted, after the lapse or expiration of the *preparation period* (as per *Ch.* IX. MINISTERS COLLECTIVELY, § 15, *Locable, who*)—no person who has not place in the *General Locable list*, to which he cannot have been aggregated without passing through the course of examination undergone before the Examination Judicatory, will be locable in any grade of the Erudite class.'—*p.* 59.

The remainder of the book is devoted to the questions which affect the interests and well-being of the Stipendiary; and there is scarcely anything relating to his term and conditions of service, enlistment, recruitment, furlough, discharge or disbandment, promotion, discipline, protection from oppression, subsistence, pay, pension, prize-money, powers as to non-military persons, military judicature, and collateral or occasional employments, which is not discussed at length. In so much that if any should be taken with a curiosity to know how a great jurisconsult would frame an army, they can do nothing better than make themselves masters of the whole.

A Supplement at the end contains a Section "on Courts Martial" and another of "Subsidiary Observations" on military subjects, which appear to be the work of *aides-de-camp* at home and abroad*. The following extracts from the last, are given solely with a view to the circulation of their contents in the existing state of Europe.

* The Section on Courts Martial is believed to have been by Colonel Young of the East-India Company's service. The "Subsidiary Observations," and the notes which occasionally appear with the addition of "*Editor*," were by the author of the present Article.—*Added in* 1839.

'ART. 2.—*On the Rifle for Defensive Force.*'

'It has been asserted that the invention of bombs decided the superiority of standing armies over citizen levies, and gave a blow to civil liberty in most of the states of Europe*. The invention of the rifle appears calculated to reverse the superiority.

'On this head, question may be the following:—If an army of citizen defenders were opposed to an invading regular force, in such numbers on the two sides respectively as should balance the difference in the habit of acting in organized masses, and make the chances equal,—would not a relative advantage be given to the citizens, if both sides were to receive the power of arming themselves with rifles at discretion, with time for learning the mechanical use of the instrument?

'It may be maintained that there would:—1. Because, the citizens being the greatest number, the sum of all the additions that could be made to the efficiency of individuals on their side, would be greater than the sum on the other.—2. Because the additions to the power of the individual citizens, are in the same direction in which the advantage of the aggregate lay before: but the additions to the power of individuals in the regular force, (if extended beyond the comparatively small number who might be employed as irregular combatants before), are in a different direction, and consequently for every addition to the strength of the aggregate in one direction, there is a diminution in another. Or if it be clearer, say—the tendency of the change upon the whole, is to transfer the mode of combat from that in which the regular force has most advantage, to that in which the citizens.

'The *Aide-Mémoire* for the use of the French Artillery (edition of 1819) contains the only known statement of the relative powers of the rifle and the common musquet.

'The result of experiments there stated is, that the superior efficiency of the rifle (circumstances for and against, all taken into account) is, in situations appropriate to its use, as thirteen to five†.

---

* Montesquieu, *Lettres Persanes.*

† Des épreuves comparatives, faites à Magdebourg, en mars 1814, par MM. le C. de B. Dussaussoy, etc., Officiers d'Artillerie, avec le Fusil d'Infanterie tiré avec balles de 18 et de 20 à la livre; et la Carabine, dite du calibre de 22, rayée de 7 raies en spirale, tirée avec balles de 26 à la livre, tantôt nue, tantôt enveloppée de papier ou de calepin, tirée à 1-40 de livre de poudre, pointés horizontalement à 70 toises du but, ont donné les résultats suivans:

1°. La Carabine a plus de portée que le Fusil avec balles de 20, et presque autant que le Fusil avec balles de 18;

2°. La justesse du tir de la Carabine, et sa portée, sont d'autant plus grandes, que la balle a été plus forcée, pourvu cependant qu'on n'outre-passe pas certaines limites;

3°. La Carabine a 4 fois plus de justesse que le Fusil avec balles de 18, et 12 fois que le Fusil avec balles de 20;

4°. *Avec de bons tireurs, et dans le même temps on tire: 20 coups de Fusil, et on touche 5 fois une Cible de 5 pieds de haut sur 3 de large....16 coups de Carabine, et on touche 13 fois le même but.*—Aide-Mémoire à l'usage des Officiers d'Artillerie de France. 5ème édition, 1819. Table des Matières, p. xxxii.

'(*Technical Remarks, inserted by the Editor.*)—The number 26, where it appears in the first paragraph of the above, has been substituted for 16 which is a manifest misprint in the original.

'For practical evidence of the effect of the rifle for Defensive Force, reference may be had to America. Who will make any permanent impression on the United States, with their population of riflemen? Who would dictate forms of government to France, if in addition to her stipendiary army, she had an equal number of volunteer riflemen from her radical force?

'The result in favour of the rifle would probably have been considerably greater, if instead of the French rifle of small dimensions (as described in other parts of the *Aide-Mémoire*), had been employed the English military model, with barrel of thirty French inches, and balls of the same size as the French musquet.

'The above statement is curiously at variance with the objections presented in preceding editions of the *Aide-Mémoire*, and allowed to continue in the last: the whole of which are founded on the supposition of mismanagement. There is no necessity for the ball being driven with violence; all that is required being, that by means of its greased cloth it should go down smoothly like the sucker of a pump. Hence the loading is easy, either on foot or horseback. The powder to be in blank cartridges, like those used in exercise; the balls covered with their greased cloth, twisted together at the ends. The ramrod of hard wood, cylindrical, of nearly the diameter of the bore; any bruise from an iron ramrod making the barrel useless ever afterwards. It is easy to add a bayonet of 28 or 30 inches long; making the whole length the same as in the musquet, and without diminishing the power of taking aim. Many other suggestions might be added, tending to increase the ratio of the comparative efficiency of the instrument.'

One of the most important of these, is the simplification of the sights, (a point in which the artillery, both by sea and land, is, or was, capable of much improvement). The front sight (*premier visgur*) should present a right angle, like the gable-end of a roof; and be of such a height that the line drawn from the angular point to the breech (*culasse*) shall be *parallel to the axis* or central line of the bore. It should be far enough from the muzzle to be clear of the bayonet; and if the bayonet is formed and fixed like the French one, it will be no impediment in taking aim. The rear sight (*second visgur*) should be on the false-breech (*arrière-culasse*) and not on the barrel; and should consist of a perpendicular column or prism, three quarters of an inch high, of which one corner of the base stands upon the line drawn from the front sight to the middle of the false-breech, and the column itself is on the right. In this manner, to aim at an object close at hand, the top of the front sight has only to be brought into one with the *bottom* of the rear sight; and greater heights must be taken along the side of the column, in proportion as the distance is increased. For want of this, a rifleman may shoot well at a certain distance he is accustomed to, but if he was brought, like "the Leather-stocking," to shoot at a panther's head at twenty yards, he would be uncertain of his mark. In this manner the taking aim at different distances is reduced as nearly as possible to the same process as throwing a stone at greater and greater angles in proportion to the distance it is to go; and is as easily learned by practice. After the rear sight is established, the parts of it not actually employed in taking sight, should be rounded off into any form that may best prevent it from scratching the hands or catching obstacles; and to prevent the possibility of using the wrong side, it will be best to give it a curved outline.

The secret of learning to use a rifle, is in beginning at 60 paces with a large target (8 feet square), and increasing the distance by 20 paces at a time.

These suggestions are from an officer who entered the English army five and twenty years ago in the Rifle Corps, and was with it at the events of Buenos Ayres, which may perhaps in some sort be called the cradle of the present liberties of Europe. He pledges himself that all the objections which are made to the Rifle, either on foot or horseback, are founded on mismanagement; and that it will be found to be a *god-send* for the "cheap defence of nations." Think only of a weapon which multiplies the force of any given citizen in the proportion of 13 to 5; and the use of which may be learned either in concert with others or alone.

'ART. 3.—*On Military Economy.*'

'A point which may be usefully insisted on, in connexion with a treatise on Defensive Force, is the great economy, so far as relates to the Stipendiary branch, of having everything *of the best that is procurable.*

'Take for example the armature of the Infantry. The cost of an infantry-man in the Stipendiary branch, including pay, clothing, food if supplied distinct from pay, and armature with the common musquet, is ordinarily estimated at 30*l.* sterling (750 francs) a-year. The cost of an ordinary musquet is about 1*l.* sterling, and that of a rifle is, on a large estimate, 10*l.*; hence, if the rifle is supposed to last only fifteen years (which is much under the truth), and to require renewing continually at the end of that period, the additional expense of arming and keeping a man perpetually armed with a rifle, with due calculation of the value of money at 5 *per centum*, may be estimated as equal to a continual payment of 1*l. per annum.* Hence by a nation which has considerable capital at command, thirty riflemen may be raised, armed, and permanently kept on foot, for the same expense as thirty-one common infantry-men. But it has been shown that in appropriate circumstances, the advantage of the rifle over the common musquet is as 13 to 5. Hence if riflemen are raised to the extent that can be employed under such circumstances, and to no greater, 5 of these riflemen will be as useful as 13 men with musquets; or preserving the same proportion, 30 riflemen will do the service of 78 common infantry-men. But 30 riflemen are only the expense of 31 of other infantry. The expense therefore of 47 infantry-men out of 78 will be saved; or a given expense will be applied, with an increased final result in the proportion of 78 to 31, or upwards of 5 to 2.

'In the same manner a cavalry soldier is ordinarily supposed to cost about 75*l.* a-year. Let the horse be assumed to last on an average six years; and let the question be, of the effect of adding 20*l.* to the purchase-money of the horse. The additional cost of purchasing and from time to time replacing such a horse, may (with allowance for the interest of money as before) be rated as equal to a continual payment of 4*l. per annum.* Hence 75 horse soldiers mounted in the improved manner, may be maintained for the same expense as 79 of the other; or by striking off six or eight men and horses per squadron, the regiments of new cavalry will cost no more than the old. The question therefore will be, whether for certain services, such squadrons will not be more effective, than squadrons of the common kind with six or eight men and horses more in each; or whether the efficiency of the new squadrons, with equal numbers, will not be increased in a greater proportion than that of 79 to 75.

'On the same principle, if it was proposed to give the rifle to a portion of the mounted troops, the comparative expense would only be in the proportion of seventy-six to seventy-five.

'These considerations throw light on the *expensiveness* of anything that is *inferior*, in a permanent or Stipendiary force.

'In the arming of the Radical force, the economy of using the im-

proved instrument is not so demonstrable, nor so reducible to practical effect. If every man of military age in the United States of America can be induced or obliged by law to arm himself with a musquet of the cost of 1*l.*, it does not follow that it would be feasible or proper to direct him to arm himself with a rifle of the cost of 10*l.* But still, the advantage derivable from the weapon in the proportion of 13 to 5, is capable (more especially in a time of public alarm) of being held out as an effectual inducement to a great number of individuals, to arm themselves voluntarily in the improved manner.'—*pp.* 301—304.

There is a story of a pedestrian, who when invited to mount upon the coaches, used to reply that he could not afford to stop. In the same spirit it appears that a government, to a certain extent, might declare that it could not afford twenty-shilling musquets *.

On examining the details of the various struggles which have taken place between regular troops and popular forces since the memorable July, it may be gathered, that an extensive city is a slaughter-house for any number of troops who may attempt to penetrate into it, provided the citizens are determined to make the most of their advantages. These advantages, in addition to the almost certain fact of a superiority of numbers, consist in their being in the actual occupancy of a position, which if they stand to their work, must be taken, like an artichoke, leaf by leaf. If it is asked why the soldiers cannot fight with as much prospect of success as the citizens, it is for the same reason that a force outside a fortified town cannot take it by assault from a force within ;—because the position is strong, and the defenders occupy it first. The power of supplies, of relief, of shelter, and of assistance to the wounded, are also shown by experience to have been very generally in favour of the citizens. Artillery appears to have been more useful to the citizens than to the troops, which may be accounted for by the last being obliged to act in greater masses ; and cavalry, nearly useless on both sides. A pile of bricks five feet high, a few carts and coaches overturned, or even a rope stretched across a street from window to window, flanked by a dozen or two of resolute musqueteers, and backed by more of the like impediments at short distances, form a *cul de sac* which the best regiment of cavalry in the world will not enter if it can help it. Paving-stones also from the tops of houses, have been much distinguished; whereupon all arbitrary powers should Mac-

* The Dutch, a careful race, are understood to have done this in some of their possessions, by declaring that they could not afford anything but riflemen. —*Added* in 1839.

Adamize. A military friend has suggested, that the contents of a wine-merchant's store, (or *beer* would do as well), would furnish in the bottoms of bottles an equivalent to the ancient *caltrop*, an engine in which much confidence was put by our forefathers for taking off the edge of cavalry; but on this there cannot yet be written *probatum est*, though it may be assumed as certain that it would be a painful visitation to the veterinary surgeon. On the whole there seems little doubt, that future kings will abstain from attacking their capitals with cavalry; for the same reasons that cavalry is not employed to mount a breach. The writer of this knew a village in India, where a body of cavalry that engaged itself in the streets, was beaten out with long poles*; and if the people of Manchester had been moved to try their yeomanry after the same sort, it would probably have had the same result. And your dragoon, even on plain ground, is not so "fearful a wild-fowl" as men take him for. It is only because he is afraid, if a man with a musquet is not more than a match for him. Men are not put on horseback because they thereby become intrinsically superior to those on foot, but because they become capable of being employed under different circumstances. Everything therefore leads to the conclusion, that at all events cavalry is not a good instrument to execute Ordonnances in a great town.

But the greatest advantage of all, on the side of the people, is in the *morale*. Every soldier knows in his heart, without the corporal being sent to tell it him, that he was not made to fire upon the citizens. It may be disguised by any quantity of sophistry, and any conceivable mass of folly may be evinced in the framing of the oaths by which he is attempted to be bound, —but a fragment of God's grace given to all men continues to survive, and whispers to the poor musqueteer as he bites his cartridge, that his teeth were not bestowed on him for that. Scarcely a man has placed himself in the ranks, however much he may have repented afterwards, without being led on by some vision of patriotism, or some prospect of being applauded by approving friends; and none of this, he knows, is likely to be his lot. The citizen on the contrary, when once he has been fairly shown blood, is in a state of excitement that hardly admits of the sense of fear; or if he is feebly constituted, he takes his post accordingly, and allows the better men to crowd into the front. Of all bitter, painful, and abominable situations, God preserve an honest man from being set in opposition to an armed people.

* A fact of the same kind is stated in the accounts from Paris.—*Liberté reconquise. p.* 149.

Another immense advantage, connected with moral force, is in the number of ancient soldiers who infallibly throw themselves into the popular ranks. There are twenty causes which will always make an ancient soldier more likely to throw himself into the people's ranks than into the other. As the first reason, the others do not want him; they have already trampled him under foot, as one of the broken tools that serve the trade of war. New men have superseded him; and the place that once knew him in squadron, knows him no more for ever. If he has served arbitrary powers, the probability is too, that he carries away no pleasing recollections of his history. He is anxious to show his countrymen, that he has not lived for nothing; and the widest field is opened for his ambition. A corporal in an army is nothing but a corporal; but in a popular contest, a corporal who has seen war is at the very least a captain by brevet. It cannot be wondered at, therefore, that all the old swordsmen are on the side of their fellow-citizens.

If the assailants of a capital should withdraw and occupy positions to cut off its communications with the country, then the military question reduces itself to whether the country will come to the rescue, in sufficient time and force to overpower the assailants. And here history seems to show that the modes in which a body of citizens can act with effect against a regular force, reduce themselves to two; one, the obstinate defence of towns or other positions highly favourable for the defensive; the other, resolute and reckless attack, in which the science of the leaders may be displayed in arranging the direction, selecting the points, and keeping masses in reserve for particular purposes, but after the movement is once begun, the result must be chiefly left to the courage and zeal of individuals to complete. This last made the strategics of the first French revolutionary armies, and of their opponents in Vendée.

On the whole, however, the inference seems to be, that governments had much better abstain from fighting with their people. The chances have gone greatly against them hitherto; and will go worse, if they try again. Men have become captious on the conduct of their rulers; and feel a general suspicion, that "enlightened sovereigns," are such as set their houses in a blaze, and "paternal government," means violation of their daughters. They see much surer ways to safety than trusting to these phrases; and the future world will be governed by something else than that feeblest of all cants, the cant of kings.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 January, 1831.

ART. V.—1. *Report from the Select Committees of the House of Commons on the Affairs of the East-India Company. China Trade.*—London. Parbury, Allen, & Co. 1830.

2. *Minutes of Evidence taken before the Select Committee of both Houses of Parliament, appointed to inquire into the East-India Company's Affairs, and the Trade between Great Britain, the East-Indies, and China.*—London. Parbury, Allen, & Co. 1830.

THE publishers of the following remarks are practical men. In the management of their individual concerns, the only safe guides they ever found, were plain fact, physical and arithmetical proof, sober reason, and humble expediency; and they honestly confess their doubts, whether any others can be trusted to, in the more complicated affairs of societies and nations. Whatever may in the present times be the obloquy attached to it, they set theories and theorists at defiance; and mean to stand or fall by the rules of single and double entry, and the vulgar decision of a profit-and-loss account.

They are at the same time aware of the modifications, which on a subject so extensive as "The Trade between Great Britain, the East-Indies, and China," may arise out of the difference of climate, of religion, of domestic habits, and of progress in science and in the arts of common life. They are most ready to assent to the principle, that no fact should be acted on at home, till it has been ascertained in what degree its validity may be affected by the same circumstances which have given rise to the complicated structure of the Chinese alphabet, and the burning of widows at Benares. What is founded on partial examination must always be incomplete; and what is incomplete, can never be perfect. It is under the fullest impression of these truths, that the authors of the remarks bring forward,—as being in accordance with the whole of their experience, and uncontradicted, so far as their personal information has extended, by even a solitary exception,—the practical inference which follows. And that is, that *if in the prosecution of any commercial speculation, more is lost by those who lose, than is gained by those who gain, the speculation is a bad one upon the whole.* If indeed reasons could be shown, why those who gain *ought* to gain, though at the avowed expense of greater loss to those who lose,—as for example if it could be demonstrated, that the two parties belong, not to the same, but to different communities, so circumstanced that there is some allowed fitness and propriety in the one appropriating to itself the possessions of the other,—the question would assume another form. But till this plea is distinctly

raised, there appears to be no necessity for combating it. The reasoning will therefore be confined to the ground above stated. It has been advanced with caution, and will be supported with moderation; and in particular, the most unbounded attention will be paid to any arguments which may be adduced to show, that the cirmumstances of the East-India Company are such as to constitute an exception to the rule.

'THE SELECT COMMITTEE appointed to inquire into the present state of the Affairs of the EAST-INDIA COMPANY, and into the Trade between *Great Britain*, the *East-Indies*, and *China*, and to report their Observations thereupon to the House; having from time to time reported the MINUTES of EVIDENCE, and having now closed that part of the inquiry which respects the CHINA TRADE, deem it expedient to place before the House a Summary of all the Evidence which has been taken upon that subject.'—*Report from the Select Committee of the House of Commons.* p. 1.

The reason of the Committee's beginning at this particular part of their matter, which so far as may be gathered from the form in which it was laid before them was manifestly the end, is stated in the following paragraph:—

'Your Committee directed their attention, in the first instance, to the papers relating to the finances of India, laid before the House in February last by the King's command; but having found it necessary to call for further statements, your Committee determined to proceed to an examination of the state of the trade with China, postponing, until that should be completed, their inquiry into the Company's finances.'—*p.* 1.

The effect of this untoward necessity, is to direct an increased interest to any particulars in which a connexion may be found between the China Trade and the finances of India. Nevertheless the Committee immediately return to a subject relating to India finance; and subjoin the following statement:—

'The present report, therefore, will embrace only the CHINA TRADE; but as in the course of it there will frequently be occasion to use the term "Board's Rates of Exchange," it may be desirable so far to refer to the first day's Minutes of Evidence, which relate exclusively to financial matters, as to explain that phrase to mean, that in the plan for the separation of the territorial and commercial accounts of the Company, framed in obedience to the Act of the 53d Geo. III. c. 155, s. 64, the Board of Commissioners for the Affairs of India (contrary to the opinion of the Court of Directors) determined to use the old rates of exchange, according to which,

the Sicca Rupee is equivalent to 2*s.* 3*d.* ·84.
the Madras Rupee to 2*s.* 3*d.* ·408.
and the Bombay Rupee to 2*s.* 3*d.*

and which as they now materially exceed either the bullion par or the

market exchange, have the effect of giving to the Indian territory a great advantage from the Company's trade, independently of any direct benefit which may accrue to it from the appropriation of the surplus profits of that trade, as prescribed in the 57th section of the Act of the 53d Geo. III. c. 155. It is however stated that, if that advantage had not been derived by the territory in this form, there would have been a corresponding increase of the surplus so to be appropriated.'—*p.* 2.

All parts of this paragraph are not eqully lucid; but the object of the Committee appears to have been to impress upon their readers in the outset, that what is gained by the Company in the Chinese part of their concern, goes to support the Indian part; and that consequently the question for the British community is, whether the whole concern, Chinese and Indian together, is, as respects the community in general, an imposition or a benefit.

The evidence on the China Trade is classed under the following general heads, *viz.*

'The disposition of the Chinese in respect to Foreign Trade, and the mode in which their transactions with foreigners are conducted at Canton:

The state of the British trade with China, particularly of that in tea:

The mode in which the Company's sales of tea in England are conducted, and the effects of the laws which regulate the trade in that article upon the Company and upon the public respectively:

The trade of the Americans and of other foreigners with China: and

The effects expected from the abolition of the Company's exclusive privilege.

Multifarious as are the topics referred to in the evidence, they may all be comprised under one or other of these divisions; while by adopting this simple arrangement, your Committee hope to bring before the House, without troubling it with unnecessary details, a clear and comprehensive summary of the information they have obtained, abstaining from the expression of any opinion.'—*p.* 3.

The last words are of importance; because they leave room for any latitude of comment upon the statements of the conflicting parties, without compromising the respect due to the Select Committee of the House.

The disposition of the Chinese in respect to foreign trade, and the mode in which their transactions with foreigners are conducted at Canton, are described as they are collected from the evidence. In which it is only requisite to substitute the words England and English for China and Chinese, with a few

other occasional changes of local designations, to be struck with astonishment at the uniformity of nature's operations, and the similarity which exists among their effects in different quarters of the globe.

'The people of China are represented to be intelligent, industrious, and persevering; and although said to be in some measure independent of foreign trade, owing to their success in agriculture and to their extensive inland commerce, yet highly sensible of its value, and anxiously disposed to cultivate it [*What an extraordinary people!*]. This disposition, indeed, is strikingly manifested in the Chinese settlers on the Eastern islands, whose object in emigrating is the accumulation of wealth with a view to returning into their own country [*how wonderful!*], to which they have a strong attachment [*how peculiar!*]; and a further proof of this spirit is to be found in the number of Chinese junks which frequent the various ports of the Archipelago [*Only think,—that Chinese junks should frequent the various ports of the Archipelago!*].

'One witness has certainly said that the Chinese are "anti-commercial" [*Must get at the truth*]; but this term has been explained to apply, not so much to the disposition of the people as to that of the government [*Have they Corn-laws?*], whose policy, as it is stated, is adverse to foreign trade and to all foreigners, even though they [*the "Order"*] are aware of the advantages derived [*by the people*] from that intercourse. Towards the English, it is by some apprehended, that there exist peculiar jealousy and distrust, arising from a knowledge of their territorial acquisitions and military achievements in India, especially those in Nepaul and Ava.

'The government of China derives from the foreign trade a revenue, estimated at the most at 650,000*l.* per annum [*About the same as the English government derives from the tax on corn*], besides the advantage resulting from the patronage of Canton, said to be the most valuable in the empire, and to be sold by the government to the highest bidder. Hence it follows that *the local authorities are greatly interested in maintaining the trade*, which, from the same cause, is *subjected to heavy taxes and extortions*. The inhabitants also of Canton and its neighbourhood, as well as the numerous classes employed in the culture and manufacture of tea, have a deep interest in the trade [*meaning, probably, in what is left of it*], every interruption of which consequently causes great individual distress. [*The poor inhabitants of Canton and its neighbourhood! Think only of the sufferings of the inhabitants of Canton and its neighbourhood, if the rest of China should cry out for Free Trade in tea.*]—p. 4.

The never-sufficiently-to-be-admired coincidences here displayed between what takes place in China and in other countries, can only be explained upon the principle which makes it credible that an apple falls in the gardens of Koo-yoong in the same manner as in those where Newton learned his theory.

'Tea, although cultivated in maritime districts, is brought chiefly to Canton through the interior, the government prohibiting it from

being transported by sea in native vessels [*Moved evidently by a consciousness of the importance of the inland trade which is thus created. The Chinese were always our masters in internal policy.*], in which, however, in spite of that prohibition, tea is conveyed in considerable quantities [*It is astonishing how difficult smuggling is to repress, in the best regulated communities!*] to the Eastern Archipelago, and even to Canton.

'Foreign ships are not permitted to trade at Canton until security is given to the government for the payment of its dues; which security also involves responsibility for the good conduct, and submission to the laws, of the ship's company. The only persons whom the government accepts as such security are the Hong merchants [*recollect, the Hong*], formerly ten in number, but reduced by bankruptcies to seven. These, with the exception of the senior, excused upon the ground of his numerous avocations, become security for the Company's ships in turn, the whole of the Company's trade being apportioned among the seven Hong merchants in shares.'—*p.* 6.

How the Hong maintain their numbers against the other accidents of life,—as for example, whether they are chosen by a house list, or are hereditary,—has not been clearly established by the evidence. It is stated, however, that at Christmas 1829,

'the Hong, generally, were in such a deplorable condition as to render necessary either "a radical change of system," [*so in the original*] or an increase in the number of Hong merchants. With a view to this object, a negotiation was commenced by the Select Committee with the local authorities; and advices have recently been received, dated the 23d of February and 2d of March last, announcing that this negotiation had led to the addition of three merchants to the Hong, and to the expression of a desire on the part of the Viceroy of Canton further to increase the number.'—*p.* 8.

An inference from this would be, that the Viceroy of Canton is the propagator of the Hong; and that his exertions may be stimulated by an application of the Select Committee. But the evidence is perhaps scarcely sufficiently direct, for the establishment of these points.

'The Hong merchants form the body through which the government of China permits the foreign trade to be carried on, allowing, however, other persons (designated in the evidence as "Outside Merchants" and "Shopmen") to trade with foreigners; but not in certain articles, such as tea, raw silk, cloths, and woollens, all of which are by the Chinese edicts reserved exclusively to the Hong merchants, they being responsible for the duties of the outside merchants.

'The Hong merchants are by law mutually responsible for each other, to a limited amount; but that regulation does not appear to be always enforced.'

'No one is responsible for the debts of the outside merchants [*How ingenious; responsible for the payment of the duties, but not of the debts*], and traders are warned of this in official notifications.'—*p.* 7.

'The object of the Chinese government in their several regulations affecting foreign trade, is stated to be that that trade should be always within their own control. This would have been more completely secured than at present, had that government accomplished a plan, proposed in 1814, under the sanction of an imperial edict, for giving to two or three of the senior Hong merchants, as the agents of the government, an absolute power to fix prices. The attempt was resisted by the Company's Supercargoes, who, after having recourse to the measure (adopted usually by the Chinese when they have an object to attain) of stopping the trade, succeeded in defeating an arrangement which must have proved injurious to all foreigners in China.'—*p.* 9.

'Smuggling in various articles is carried on in China to an immense extent, and to the injury of the Hong merchants, who are never concerned in it. It takes place chiefly in the contraband article of opium, which is imported into China in country and American ships, and much of which is purchased at the Company's sales in India.'

'The Chinese government prohibits the use of opium upon a moral principle; but this prohibition, although frequently reiterated in imperial proclamations, is not only disregarded by the people, but also by the government officers, who appear systematically to connive at the smuggling of opium, and to derive a large profit from the bribes of the smugglers. The Company's servants in India and China are cognizant of the fact that the opium sold at their sales is conveyed to China, but they are expressly prohibited from having any dealings whatever in that article. [*That is, the Company's servants grow opium with all their might for the China market, but they let others be the carriers, because the Chinese government has prohibited opium upon a moral principle.*]—*p.* 10.

So ends the report upon the disposition of the Chinese in respect to foreign trade, and the mode in which their transactions with foreigners are conducted at Canton. The representatives of the people have weighty duties; and a full consciousness of this must have been present, to enable the Members to have proceeded thus far as befitted the gravity of a Select Committee, without bursting into laughter at the solemn absurdities of the most absurd nation under the sun, always excepting the nation that copies them. Nothing but official dignity could have carried men through the examination of such an enormous farce. A government in China that restrains foreign trade, in order that it may collect a revenue of 650,000*l.* and sell the patronage of a single port to the highest bidder; and a government in England that does the same. Tea prohibited from being carried in the vessels that could carry it cheapest, in order that it may be carried in some other that shall be dearer. A *Hong* with pigtails, in Canton; and another without, in Leadenhall-Street. "Outside-merchants and Shopmen" al-

lowed to trade with foreigners, but not in certain articles, as tea, &c. which must be reserved for the Hong. Hongs, after all, " in a deplorable condition." Hongs never smuggle, because smuggling is " to their injury." Governments in both countries, much moved by " moral principle." Concluding question, this; whether if the Chinese should be found some morning to have sent the *Hong* to sea upon empty tea-chests, and to have conveyed their moral government canal-ways to the other side of the Great Wall, they would not have done the most sensible thing recorded in their history.

If there was not perpetual evidence at hand, it would be incredible and past the powers of human persuasion to establish, that men whose whole life is given to commerce,—who live and move and have their being in one continual round of experiments on the nature and consequences of trade and barter,—who are as sharp as hawks to the perception of any the smallest advantage or disadvantage in a negotiation with an individual antagonist, and as tenacious as ferrets to hold their gripe when they have got it,—it would be utterly incredible, that men like these should be completely baffled and unable to trace the fact, that everything which is paid for at a higher price than need be paid for it, causes a simple loss of the difference in price to the consumer, in the same manner as if he was directed by his government to throw it into the sea; and that further all gain or advantage to the receiver of the dishonest price, is obtained by the equal loss and damage, first, of the " Outside merchants and Shopmen" who would have supplied the goods at an equitable price by a fair trade, and secondly, of those traders wherever they may be scattered, with whom the difference of price which is given for nothing to the monopolists, would have been laid out in something else. So that all restrictions of this nature do really amount to somebody robbing somebody; and not only one somebody, but three somebodies; to wit, first the consumer, and afterwards the two sets of individuals who ought to have traded with him in an honest way *. Manchester does not know this; Liverpool has not yet found it out; or Manchester and Liverpool would join the consumers in so loud a note, as should frighten all Hongs from the Mersey to Canton. The Americans are trading prosperously without a Hong, and carrying out the very goods to China which the Liverpool-man may not; and all because the American has too much hold upon his government to allow himself to be hindered. No doubt there is in America disposition enough to make a Hong; but the American is able to resist it, and the Englishman is not.

* See the Art. on Free Trade, Westminster Review, 1 January, 1830, (*p. 191 of this Volume.*)

Of the arguments brought forward on both sides (which are mustered by the Committee with an equanimity truly admirable), those which go to prove the evils that would result from the removal of the Hong in England, are in the main reducible to the apprehension that other people would not know how to leave off a trade when it was a bad one. The Hong wants to be a paternal government; and the infant simplicity of Liverpool is to travel in a go-cart under its direction. All these reasonings may be met by the example of the Americans; who use their own legs, without being the worse for it.

One argument however demands notice apart; and it is connected with the reason which induced the Committee to begin with its business at the end. The profit of the Company upon the China trade for the last fifteen years, is stated to have amounted to nearly 17 millions of pounds sterling (*p.* 38). But in order to reconcile the consumer to this, he is told

'that these profits have afforded to the Company the means not only to pay the dividend upon the East-India stock, and the interest of the bond debt (the latter of which however, it is contended, should not be charged on the commerce of the Company), but also of materially aiding the finances of the Indian territory, which are said to be in such a situation as to render that assistance necessary.'—*p.* 38.

The whole of which being analyzed amounts to a representation, that if the Hong have a good trade in one place by the loss and damage of the community, they have a bad one in another, which neither does good to themselves nor the community, by the token that it does not pay its own expenses. And therefore the Hong argue, that they have the ingenuity to tack these two trades together, and that a trade by which the community loses, and a trade by which nothing is gained, in conjunction make a benefit. And this brings on the inquiry, of what is the good of India,—*who* gains by it, and *how*. For the Hong have demonstrated, and with some success, that they do not pocket the profits of the China trade directly, but pour them into the great mash-tub of India. Who then profits by India? And here the secret is found to be, that the residents in India, and those who accumulate fortunes there to bring home, are an offset supported in the main by a land-tax screwed to the extent of taking away all property in the soil from the natives of the country, but still unable to make both ends meet, without taking seventeen millions in fifteen years from the consumers of tea in England to aid. The Hong therefore gain, not directly but indirectly. Those of them who have returned with fortunes from India, have for their share the fortunes they have made, or such part as has come out of the tea-pots of Great Britain

and been thence transferred to Indian account. And these and the others, have moreover all that is drawn, had, and received, by their kin, clan, and connexions, who may in any shape make part of the great out-lying detachment; so far, at least, as what a man has the power of giving to his connexions, may be justly said to be given to himself. Here then is the ultimatum of the process; a general officer in India wears a coat paid for by the halfpence of English washerwomen, and the judge and magistrate's palanquin is borne by the sinews of the operative whose soul aspires to tea. It is part and parcel of the general plot, by which the aristocracy of England are to be supported by the commonalty. They dare not take it from them directly; they dare not take it without the trouble of going to China or India to fetch it. But they *do* take it; and trust to the hocus-pocus of the circuit, for the concealment of the fact. An individual may get his living very honestly in India or China, and so far as his insulated conduct has been concerned may have hardly earned the competency he brings home. But that does not make it honest, that washerwomen in England should be robbed to enable gentlemen to bring home competencies from abroad. But so it is; the government has been given up to the higher classes; clergy, lawyers, squires, and till of late years every man who wore a good pair of small-clothes, have joined their efforts on one single point, which was, to persuade the industrious that they had nothing to do with the laws but to obey them. And the consequence has been, that in one shape or other, and under various degrees of transfusion, modification, perplexity, puzzle, and circuitousness, the industrious classes have been saddled with the keep and maintenance of those which have been the law-makers: the oppressive classes all the time keeping up an outcry of danger to property, while behind it they were organizing the means of taking everybody's property themselves. One set of men is to be maintained in the East, and another in the West; and by an avowed and specific rule, no man is to be admitted into the House of Representatives, unless he can prove that he has a personal interest in supporting the great injustice of all, the maintenance of the landlords by a tax on bread. The people of this country know perfectly the situation in which they are; and the knowledge is not confined to the weak and ignorant who may be injured with impunity. The men who are now coming forward with a demand for justice, are not the poor imps who may be cut to pieces by yeomanry and a bill of indemnity be passed the week after; but they are the men of one thousand a-year who ought to be men of two. They are the *Garde Bourgeoise* of the society; and if they

stand by the others, it will be hard if they do not make themselves attended to. Learned lords may well say there is a glut of manufactures; when there is a law to prevent them from being sold for what is wanted in return. The manufacturing and trading interests are nearly extinct by act of parliament; for the greatest part of what go by those names, are only pumps to pump out the moisture of the industrious classes, and pour it into the vessels of the favoured few. Commercial polity is one matted fraud; a *plica polonica* of intertwisted wrongs, in which nothing is palpable but that the patient pays for all. But the end is at hand; the government has acknowledged the necessity for amendment, and the injured masses are halted to see what measures it pursues. If the present men do nothing, somebody else will. After all that has been said in scorn, the march of intellect will be too strong for the oppressors; and political economy will be the stripling to lay the hands of the eyeless giant upon the pillars of their pride,

---

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 January, 1831.

ART. XIII*.—1. *Three Lectures on the Rate of Wages, delivered before the University of Oxford, in Easter Term*, 1830. *With a Preface on the Causes and Remedies of the present Disturbances.* By Nassau William Senior, of Magdalen College, A. M.; late Professor of Political Economy.—1830.

2. *Correspondence between the Right Hon. R. Wilmot Horton and a Select Class of the Members of the London Mechanics' Institution, formed for investigating the most efficient remedies for the present distress among the labouring classes in the United Kingdom; together with the Resolutions unanimously adopted by the Class. Also a Letter from the Right Hon. R. Wilmot Horton to Dr. Birkbeck, President of the Institution: and his Answer.*—1830.

3. *The Life and History of Swing, the Kent Rick-burner.* Written by himself.—1830.

IF Noah and his family, when they came out of the ark, had held a council upon the best way of providing themselves with the comforts of dry land, it would have been a strange line of argument for one of the household to have pointed to the stock in trade which had escaped the deluge, and have said, "This is a plough, and by harnessing the clean beasts to it, "you would do six times as much work as with the spade; "therefore break the plough, and take the spade. Your wife "too has a spindle, with which she can spin so many threads "in an hour; but I could show her a way, that would not spin "half as much. Let us be machine-breakers; and then we "shall all be comfortable."

---

* Published in the form of a Pamphlet, *In answer to "Swing."*

This would be such gross absurdity, that it is hardly practicable to set about stating wherein the absurdity consists. It is like a man's cutting off his legs, in order that he may have the pleasure of hopping upon crutches. Noah's brief answer would be, that he worked to *have;* and that the more he had, the better. The wildest enemy of machinery would never dream of executing such a principle in his own immediate concerns; or of taking the worse instrument when he might take the better, for the simple pleasure of having more to do. The case, therefore, does not present a parallel to the existing question on the subject of machinery.

Take, then, another state of mankind, as for instance Abraham's; who had men-servants and women-servants, and a steward to look after them. Now if the steward had proposed, that the men should be set to dig instead of plough, and the women weave cloth with their fingers instead of using the best piece of loom-machinery the country was acquainted with, and that the reason for all this was, that without it there would be no possibility of keeping them in employment,—the answer of Abraham would be much the same as Noah's, but with the addition, that if their work could be saved in one way, he would be answerable for finding them work in some other;—that if the women could make two pieces of cloth instead of one, his wife should wear two at once, or else wear one that by its beauty should take as much making as two.

But if the steward was an obstinate person, and had an anti-machinery maggot in his head, he might reply, that if each servant could do twice as much as before, it was evident only half the number would be wanted, and therefore half must be either sold to the Midianites, or left to perish in the desert, which would be very hard upon the individuals. To which his master would reply, that if the gift of doing double work should fall on all of them at once as from the clouds, there might be some possibility of a part of them being an incumbrance; but if there was anything gradual in the operation, he, the master, would be answerable for work springing up for them as fast as they could find the means of doing it, and that not a hoof should be left behind in consequence of improvements in the method. And if the master, as there appears no reason to doubt, was fond of seeing everybody satisfied about him, he would take an opportunity of representing to his people and followers, that it would be hard if the improvements did not in some degree turn to the advantage of every one of them;—that if there was more corn by ploughing than by digging, there must needs be better feeding for themselves, their wives, and their little ones; and that if cloth was easier made and more abundant, it was

scarcely possible that the result should not be that the children would come by three shirts a-year instead of two. There would be no doubt that a principal portion of the advantage would fall to the share of the rich master and his immediate relatives; but it would also be certain, that the servants down to the lowest would be better and not worse for the alteration, and that they would be unreasonable if they raised a hue-and-cry against the change.

This then, if anybody has thought worth while to follow it, appears to let into the whole secret of the good and evil of machinery. It is a good to everybody, working classes included, if only it does not come so rapidly as to throw great masses of people out of employment, faster than the consequent demand for hands in other branches can take them up. If the community in general by dint of machinery get a piece of cloth for six shillings instead of ten, they will to a certainty expend the four shillings in something else that they would not have expended it in before; unless it can be proved that they will throw it into the sea. If therefore there is a diminution of employment for cloth-makers to the amount of four shillings (which is undeniably the case), there is at the same time an increase of expenditure on some other arts and crafts to the same amount. But if other arts and crafts are affected in a like manner by machinery, each of these throws an increase of expenditure on some others, among which the craft of cloth-making will undoubtedly have a share. And if wages fall when employment is diminished, they rise when it is increased. So that provided only the introduction of machinery be gradual and general, there is an evident tendency towards a balance; and though nobody can say that the balance shall be so complete as to leave everything exactly as before, it is plain that the final alteration is the *difference* of the particular alterations, and not the *sum*. But all this time, there is a clear gain to the consumers at every step, of the whole amount of what is saved in each instance by machinery,—or what in the case of the cloth was represented by four shillings. So that while the effects upon the different operatives, in respect of their quantity of employment, go on balancing and counteracting each other, and are in the end next to none at all,—the gains of the consumers (of whom the operatives make part) go on increasing and accumulating by every particular addition. Or to turn the subject the other side up, if machinery of all kinds in all places could be annihilated at once by an Act of Parliament or a thunderbolt, the quantity of employment for operatives would on the whole be just what it is now; but the operatives would take their share,

with everybody else, of the consequences of cloth being made with fingers instead of with a loom. That is, they would wear just so much cloth, and of such quality, as could be made with fingers by the exertion of the same time and labour which make what they now wear from the loom; and the same in other things. And note further, that this includes only the home trade. But if ever foreign commerce should cease to be prohibited by Act of Parliament, then there must be taken into the account all the good things that might be obtained from foreigners in exchange for the products of machinery, and the share which the operatives would have in these good things by dint of the increased employment which would be created by the demand for manufactured goods.

The blunder therefore of desiring to put down machinery, is in the main and in the long run the same as the contemptible fallacy of restrictions upon trade, which is pressed upon the operatives by the supporters of the Corn Laws. The apparent gain made at every step of restriction either on trade or on machinery, is balanced by an equal loss to some other portion of the industrious classes somewhere else, and there is a clear unbalanced loss of the amount in question to the consumers in the aggregate besides. But the operatives are to be persuaded, that if John, Thomas, Richard, and Henry, get sixpence each, by at the same time taking twopence out of the pocket of each of the other three,—John, Thomas, Richard, and Henry make a gain; and not only this, but that they do so if John, Thomas, Richard, and Henry in their quality of consumers, lose another sixpence among them every time besides. This is the sum and substance of the system that calls itself *protection to trade*. It is a plan to set everybody to rob the rest, and count the plunder as a general gain. The subject, as relates to trade, has been examined at length in a former article*, under the illustration of the monkeys in Exeter Change, who chose to feed out of each other's pans; where it was shown that the land monopoly is the great baboon of all, for whose benefit the lesser apes are persuaded to aid in keeping up the fraud.

Machinery then, like the rain of heaven, is a present blessing to all concerned, provided it comes down by drops, and not by tons together; and anything which prevents its free and expanded operation, has an effect of the same kind as would be produced if the rain could be collected into waterspouts. It remains therefore to be seen, what laws and human institutions have done towards securing the free diffusion of

* Article on Free Trade, Westminster Review, 1 Jan. 1830. (*p.* 191 *of this Vol.*)

the advantages derivable from God's gift of ingenuity to man. And here the first thing apparent in our own country is, that the aristocracy have made a law, that no use shall be derived from it at all. They have determined by Act of Parliament, that men may invent as many machines as they think proper, but shall not be allowed to sell the produce; or which comes to the same thing, shall not be allowed to sell for what is wanted in return. The whole misery about machinery,—every atom and fragment of suffering, alarm, and wretchedness directly or indirectly consequent thereon,—is the pure and necessary result of the gross fraud and half-witted idiotic cruelty perpetrated by the majority of the landlords upon the rest of their own order and of the community. The compiler of this is a landlord; he has a qualification for a county; but he is not such a dolt as to believe that he is gaining by the profligacy of the Corn Laws, even if he had no other objection to the fact. Like everybody else, he has been obliged to reduce his rents; but he did it with a stipulation, that they should be raised again on the removal of the Corn Laws. All rotten sheep are his to pay for; complaint and misery, the fit consequences of cruelty and injustice, are in every department both of the live stock and the dead. And in addition to this, he has to struggle with the impossibility of putting his children into any calling they can live by. His only hope is that what "Swing" leaves, the poor-rates may speedily swallow *; and if the operation be but quick and general, the result may be some comfort for his posterity. It is a hard case that there should be no hindering men from ruining others, except by their finding out that they have ruined themselves; but if it is so, there is nothing to be done but pray for the quickest completion of the process.

It will probably be answered, that the distress just now is in the agricultural districts; and how can it be shown that this would be helped by the removal of the Corn Laws? Easily; as any person may see who has not a reason for blindness in his pocket. When the quantity of food procurable is limited by law, and the population has increased till it presses against this limit, there is no difficulty in seeing that the misery thus produced must extend itself to the agricultural population as well as others. Only a given number of agricultural labourers can be wanted to raise a given quantity of corn, and therefore, since all other employments are equally circumscribed, the increase above the given number must be starved on the same principle that puppies are drowned; and the starved puppies

* The landed tyrants were beforehand with him. Perhaps they took the hint, from this and other unguarded passages. *They made the New Poor Law.*—Author, in 1839.

are what the landlords call superfluous population. They make a law that there shall not be food for more than a certain number, and therefore the rest shall be executed as superfluous. But if this is to be the case with dogs in general, it is clear that the agricultural breeds can have no prospect of escape. The plea that the sufferings of the agricultural labourers would be increased by the removal of the Corn Laws, is therefore only one of the juggleries by which those who have more cunning impose upon those who have less. It might not give instant relief, or there might even be an increase of pain on the commencement of the process, especially if gone about too precipitately; as is the case in the cure of a broken leg. But the great cause of evil would be removed, without which there is no question but of the sufferer's being left to dié. The plea therefore is one of those subterfuges, which no educated man puts forward with a grave countenance without having an interest in its success.

But to the less educated classes,—to those who have not been in the habit of considering that to bolt straight forward is not always the way to get out of the bog,—it is quite reasonable and to be expected that the assertion that the miseries of the agricultural labourers come by the Corn Laws, should present considerable difficulties; and they may even at first sight pronounce it ridiculous and absurd, in which opinion they will be encouraged by the horse-laughs of those among their betters who are driving them upon destruction. On the credit therefore of some good-will shown towards the suffering classes here and elsewhere, the agricultural labourers in the disturbed districts—the men who are marching under the banner of "Swing," if he *has* a banner—are invited to sit down under the first convenient hedge, and engage the best reader in their company to explain to them the following case. Suppose then a farmer,—or a farmer's labourer, for they are both in the same plight,—has two sons and two daughters, which it is well known is about the number that, taking one with another, a married couple have. And suppose, as is evidently the fact, that there are a number of other people in the same circumstances in the neighbourhood, and the hope and wish of the parents is, that the sons of one shall marry the daughters of another, and sit down in some honest calling to maintain themselves in godliness and decency as their fathers did. Now let us see, what chance they have for it. Fifteen years ago came the Corn Laws; in other words, an Act to prevent the manufacturers from exchanging their work for corn with foreigners. And the farmers and farmer's labourers crowed loud, and thought it was a fine thing for *them*;—that is, fifteen years ago they

crowed, but do they crow now? It shall be granted that when this unjust restriction on the manufacturers began, it was an advantage to the man whose trade it was to hold the plough. The quantity of land which was to grow corn in England was artificially increased; and this made more farms to let, and more farmer's labourers wanted to work upon them; and therefore it was easier for the farmer and the farmer's man to find employment for himself, and for his two sons and two daughters as they grew up upon his hands. There was increased room made for them to spread, at other people's expense; and therefore they went on merrily, and spread accordingly. But this could not last for ever. Allow the fact to be, that one-fourth more land in England was brought into cultivation by the Corn Laws. It is plain that it will be merry times for ploughmen while they are breeding up to this mark; but why are they to be merry when they *have* bred up to it? Is it the slightest consolation, comfort, or advantage to them, that they are now *five* hundred thousand poor starving devils, instead of being *four?* Or is it any comfort to the higher farmer who sees himself crushed out of all possibility of livelihood by the competition of men for farms, that there are ten of them to bid against each other instead of eight? Impress therefore on yourselves, you whole regiment of Swing, that if the Corn Laws were a fraud upon other people, they were, like all other frauds, of short-lived advantage to the owner; and that you are now come to the time when, unless you can live upon the meat and drink of fifteen years ago, the roguery that directed the plan has at all events done *you* no good, whatever it may have done to anybody else.

But you will say,—and it's all right,—that this has only proved, that you are where you would have been before; and therefore you have only to be thankful for what you have had already. But hear more; there is a "bit to follow*." See how the case would have stood with you, if there had never been Corn Laws at all. It may be quite true, that instead of *five* hundred thousand farmers and farmers' labourers, there would only have been *four;*—that is to say, there would only have been four hundred thousand of you that would have been farmers and farmers' labourers; and the rest would have been somewhere else. And what is more, they would have been living merrily somewhere else, and everybody would have been merry, and you would have been merry too; for it is nothing but the impossibility of finding employment for your two sons and two daughters, either

* A phrase at a tavern, famous for its "sizes" of venison.—*Added in* 1839.

in farming business *or in anything else*, which drives you up in heaps to starve one another. If two-thirds of the farmers' sons could get comfortable situations although not farmers, it needs no extraordinary wisdom to see that the pressure of competition among farmers would speedily decrease, and farming become a good trade again for the remainder; and the same with farmers' labourers. None of you have ever taken an oath that your two sons and two daughters shall be nothing but what their parents were. The labourer never had any objection to see one of his boys set up in a little shop, or another go creditably to sea in the employment of the merchant that buys his pork at Christmas; or to have his daughters married to his neighbours' sons as soon as they had succeeded in any of those callings. The farmer used to exult, when his landlord's influence established one son upon the high stool in a merchant's counting-house; for there *were* merchants in those days,—it was before the landlords had spoilt all by their selfish tyranny. All these trades and callings,—that is to say, every branch of manufactures and commerce,—would have been brisk and flourishing. Our sailors would have been "rampaging" over the world; and now they are dying in the streets, because the merchants have nothing to carry or bring home, and Indiamen flog them beyond endurance. An industrious man might have lived by his industry, though not perhaps in one given calling that should be fixed upon. It used to be so; and would have been so still, if England could have held her own against the invasion of the squirearchy. And to this we must come back; or else go on in the present miserable state of things to the end of time.

The question then is, how we are to come back. And here it may be agreed, that the change must not be all at once, for then it would create pressure on the agricultural labourers faster than the openings made in other ways could take it off. And heaven knows that the agricultural labourers, like all other labourers, are miserable enough. Nobody wants to diminish the sufferings of others by increasing theirs; but to get rid of the whole burden of misery, which is breaking everybody's back for the use and benefit of those who never work at all. Therefore, as said before, it must be done gently. Nobody, for instance, could complain, if the mischief was as long in taking off as it was in laying on; and this, or something like it, would be done by taking off a shilling a-year from all the rates on foreign corn till they were gone. But it would not be difficult to show, that a quicker course than this would be for the general good; though this would be better than nothing, and is the very least that men in their senses should think of agreeing to accept. Get the mischief into a way of being ended some time, and then take all

other methods in aid that ingenuity can devise; but do not let the man lie perishing with his broken leg without thinking of having it set, and cry "O lord! O lord! why that would be a six weeks' business at the least."

Once more then, the "deluded followers of Swing" as the newspapers call them, are begged to sit down and give their serious attention to the assurance here given them, that however unlikely it may at first appear, the Corn Laws are the origin, cause, and maintenance, of their present sufferings, and that they have only to chuse between going on as they are for ever, or joining with the rest of their countrymen in a demand for the total removal by the quickest method that prudence shall direct. It is not expected that they should find this out at once; any more than men who have vastly greater opportunities of gaining knowledge have found things out at once. But what is requested of them is, that they will think of it, that they will attend to it, that they will turn it over in their minds, and see if it may not after all come under the proverb, that what looks the longest way about, is sometimes the nearest way home. Let them take it to the schoolmaster, let them discuss it at the blacksmith's shop, let it be inquired into on Sundays at the bakehouse and in the church porch. And above all things get it to the little farmers and the great; let nobody fall into the error of believing it is a question in which only the paupers are concerned. A trial has been made of robbery, and it has only brought the farmers and farmers' labourers into a state of indescribable misery; would it not be wise to try honesty, and see if it may not lead to better things? Was there ever a piece of dishonesty yet, that by God's just judgment did not in some way fall on the heads of the inventors in the end? Make up your minds upon this point. See your way clearly through the wretched deception by which the landlords have attempted to raise their own rents and send *you* to the poor-house. Burn no more haystacks, but join heartily with your countrymen of the manufacturing districts in a legal demand for the removal of the Corn Laws, which have ground you all to the dust together; and you will be astonished to see what sort of people will be ready to take your part. Foreign trade has been prohibited; call for its being opened. You are starving as it is; try whether you will be starved twice over by the country's having foreign trade. Make some inquiry too, into the sort of men who recommend this to you. Ask if they have any interest in deceiving you; or if they ever tried to deceive anybody, whether they had an interest or not. Inquire too, whether they are inferior in education, or in the habit of finding out the reason of one thing from another thing, to those who take the other side. And if

they are not, then let them have at least a hearing, and such confidence afterwards as you shall think that they deserve.

This is what may be said to the suffering classes. If there is any need to defend the saying it, the defence will not be far to seek. When men from some cause, no matter what, find themselves at sea in the same bottom, and some urgent peril begins to press on the floating community; there are two courses for every man to take, who has ever pretended to addict himself to the study of sea-borne business. One is to go below; and if the danger be very pressing, to go to bed. The other is, to stand the peril out, quailing before no man's fears, crouching before no man's folly, rising in loudness in support of reason in proportion as others may try to put it down, and braving the risk of being sent to make the land in a whale's belly, sooner than yield an inch to the knavish lubbers that have brought us into the scrape. It is in this spirit, that new allies proceed to join the little company, who having leisure and education, are too proud to turn them against the public interests, and too wise to use them against their own. Not that the coincidence may be perfect; or the agreement so complete as not to leave room for friendly dispute in better times. But it is quite sufficient for pulling at the same rope, till at all events the ship's head is laid the right way, and something like a course is steering for bringing her into port.

Suppose now, the peril were, a failure of provisions; and there the gallant ship was laid,—*hove to*, as the sea monsters call it,—with the crew, that is to say the vulgar haulers, dying about the decks, and here and there a portly person engaged in calculating how many pieces a biscuit could be broken into, and whether the captain's fowls could be reduced to five quarts of water in the place of six. Imagine such a scene, and estimate the boldness of the individual who should maintain, that all this might be well as an accessory, but the first thing was to turn the head towards some place where provisions grew; and that no plea of the urgency of earlier relief, could atone for the procrastination of this only final chance of safety. Nor would the case be altered, even though it could be proved that the suffering would be temporarily increased by the efforts necessary for the process of deliverance. It has not pleased heaven to make remedies always luxuries, more particularly where the evils endured have been the consequences of men's own misconduct. When the community has allowed itself so long to drift down the stream of folly, for the sake of the paltry baits held out to individual cupidity,—it has no right to expect that the way back should be as easy as the going, and may thank its stars if ever it finds itself on safe

ground again, either with or without the salvation of the individuals that led it into the mischief.

There is no use in keeping back the truth. A particular class, the landed interest as they rejoice to style themselves, succeeded in persuading the community that nothing could go well unless they had their way. How much of this was self-deception, heaven only knows; but if they succeeded in making fools of other people, there is no known reason why to a certain extent they should not have succeeded in the same manner with themselves. At all events they had their way; and the first thing they did, was to prohibit the exchange of the poor man's industry for bread. Whether the manufacturers, if they had haply got the upper hand instead, would have laid a tax on home-grown corn, by way of increasing the quantity that should be bought with their goods from abroad, is what there has not been opportunity to try; but if they had, it would not have been one whit a more outrageous and barefaced wrong, a more wanton and reckless abuse of power, or a fouler and more degrading violence for a civilized society to submit to. If men under such an exertion of tyranny on the part of the manufacturing interest, had risen in masses and been put down by the sword and the executioner, it might be true enough that this evil was an inevitable consequence, and for that very reason there would be two evils instead of one to be reckoned for with the manufacturers whenever the day of justice should arrive. There would be no use in tampering with such a rank oppression. It would be an ill which those who were given to bear, would bear, and those who were not, would not; and the end would be, either the timely retreat of the plunderers of society, or a waiting till public indignation had risen high enough to drive them from their hold.

And it does not follow, that, if humanity was suffering under such an infliction from the manufacturers, the efforts by which it was put down would all be directed by the purest reasoning and the most exact statistics. The buccaneers of the society must make up their minds to take what might befall them. There would be no use in their crying out, that *this* starving wretch was out of the line of political economy, and *that other* was a bad practical philosopher. All these errors would be trifling peccadilloes, compared with the grand stalking wrong, that was at the bottom of the well or ill directed resistance of the community. Nothing can be more eminently typical of passive moderation, joined to considerable powers both of offence and defence, than a drove of oxen under the guidance of humanity and wisdom; but let them be once goaded into madness by the feeling of intolerable suffering, and it is no

excuse for the authors of the mischief, that they will stick a peer of parliament as soon as the basest of their persecutors. The ignorant and the poor,—those who are ignorant because they are poor, and poor because they are ignorant, and whom laws have been passed to make both one and the other,—cannot be expected to reason like doctors in divinity, while suffering under evils the smallest of which would fill a gazette if it could by possibility happen to the authors of their pain;—evils as distinctly referable in all their branches to the voluntary and determined acts of those who are the causes of the infliction, as the sounds of a musical instrument are to the striking of the keys;—evils which they have been told over and over, and will be told again tomorrow and the day after that, exist simply because their betters would have it so, and because the portions of the higher classes who think they gain by wrong are more numerous, united, and active than those of the same classes who set themselves in opposition to it. It is no secret; the members of the existing government avowedly hold office by the confession of the necessity for reform; and never in the history of mankind was reform so necessary, as in a country whose commercial policy is one continuous fraud upon the industrious classes, for the benefit of those whose trade and calling it is to live without working. If the labouring man eats bread, a payment is to be made for the maintenance of one portion of the aristocracy,—there's no mistake, there can be no mistake,—*the aristocracy;* though the receivers themselves are losing more at one end than they are gaining at the other, with the possible exception of those who are born to the right of providing for their children out of the public purse. If he aspires to tea, he must pay for the support of another portion somewhere else; and if he dreams of sugar, he must keep another; and to crown all, if liberation from any of these abuses is demanded for him, he is told plainly that there shall be no remission of the abuse unless he buys it at full value from the holder. He is the horse, the ass, the mule, who is to be saddled with every "splendid *lazzarone*" that finds himself too lazy to walk. It is not enough that he is to abstain from his rich neighbour's property, and even to defend it at the hazard of his life when called upon; but this property is to be held imperfect and but half conducive to the enjoyments of the owner, unless it can be employed to double itself out of the basket of the poor. If the world's history were looked through, there would not—with the single exception of negro slavery—be found so glaring and huge an instance of the abuse of power and the general misery consequent on giving one selfish class the right of legislation for the rest, as is presented by the commercial policy of this most ill-used country.

The Puritans were fond of speculating, on what a man in their place of torment would do and say, if an offer were made to give him one more trial in the present world. All perdition comes, by not thinking of this in time. If Napoleon could have re-enacted the Hundred Days, what a different conclusion would certainly have been come to. If the French *ex*-ministers could commence where Napoleon left them, how carefully would they turn their path from leading to the Luxembourg. And when their successors shall have caused revolution, with the cession of twice as much as would have satisfied if given, how willingly would they retrace their steps, if gods or men would give the faculty. So if a Whig ministry could begin again where it stands at present, six months after a whelming revolution has been brought on, how carefully would it eschew the debility, the tergiversation, which induced the mischief. All revolutions come by there being nobody who had sense to join the people, and give them half of what was the next day taken by violence. Does the English ministry believe, that the people will not have something in the end? And does it think that what would have satisfied them in November, will satisfy them in March? Or, perchance, does it wish to wait for a few more apparitions of the Sibyl with her books? The inference drawn by the people will only be, that the ministry is lying by to measure forces, and that consequently what they finally obtain, will be in exact proportion to the energy with which they make their feelings known. It is as true under one administration as under another, that "Never by any other means than the "making the ruling few uneasy, can the oppressed many "obtain a particle of relief*." If there was a disposition to make an exception in the present case, it has been much enfeebled by procrastination. The people are intreated everywhere, to spare no effort, omit no exertion, which may make the Whigs "uneasy" at the prospect of swerving from their promises.

The conductors of the present work have of necessity a certain number of friends, who will demand to see *their* statement of the points on which the community ought to stand, as the immoveable conditions of any confidence in, or support to, the present ministers. First, then, the immediate removal of the "Six Acts;" and, either at once or by a small number of definite gradations, of all the taxes affecting newspapers and advertisements. If any vested interests present themselves in opposition, let them be told to thank heaven for having gone on so long in their iniquity, and to content themselves with at all events the smallest portion of gradation and delay. Let the

* Bentham.

pitiful amount received by the revenue from the wrong, be laid on anything that can be seen, or felt, or heard, or tasted, or smelt. Let it be laid on our heads or on our heels, or on anything that is between. But let us be rid of the gross scandal and open shame, of paying a tax for being blindfolded, in order to be afterwards led by the nose where the bear-leaders may please. Let it be stated without passion or animosity, but with the decision of men who rest on a geometrical proposition, that an administration which begins by representing the necessity of preventing the communication of men's thoughts and wants, is one that may be submitted to, but never treated with. Secondly, a substantial alteration in the arrangement and extent of the elective franchise, with the protection of the Ballot to its general exercise. Thirdly, the contemporaneous removal of the Corn Laws and of the pretended protections given to manufactures in return, by any gradations that shall assign a period for their entire termination; and the maintaining of the revenue, if necessary, by a tax on property, with a just scale of rates increasing with the magnitude of the amount. In other words, let there be a tax that shall be paid *once*, even though accompanied with some unpleasantnesses in the collection; and not a tax that shall be paid ten times over in its consequences, in order that a certain number of individuals may have the pleasure of thinking they jockey each other in the shares. These points are what the Sibyl is advised to stand on now; and there are as many more, ready to be added, if she is obliged to call again.

Of the publications at the head of this Article, the first is from a quarter in which the science of Political Economy—which is in truth only the science of not being cheated by our betters—is under obligations for an introduction to academical rank in the University of Oxford. It would be affectation, not to own the satisfaction felt at the close accordance between the contents of the "Three Lectures," and the conclusions derived from a separate course of study as conducted in great part in the pages of this Review. Of the Lectures themselves, it is not easy to say anything so brief, as that they correspond to the Three Lectures on the Mercantile Theory of Wealth from the same quarter, which have been characterized as "the ablest and most entertaining publication on a question of political economy, that has appeared since the time of Adam Smith." References in support of this character may be made to the *cork-screw maker* in page 47,—to the laced coats of our ancestors in page 53,—and to the impossibility of a man's income not being spent, in page 54. This last s interesting, as it bears on the newest plan for the restoration

of the late French dynasty, by the refusal of its partisans to spend their incomes. "Quâcunque viâ datâ, every man must spend his income [*Ought there not to have been added,* or leave it for somebody else to spend?]; and the less he spends on himself, the more remains for the rest of the world."

On part of Mr. M'Culloch's celebrated examination, it is remarked,

'This reasoning assumes that the landlord, while resident in Ireland, himself personally devours all the cattle produced on his estates; for in no other supposition can there be the very same amount of commodities for the people of Ireland to subsist upon, whether their cattle are retained in Ireland or exported.'—*p.* 27.

Without inquiring whose arguments might be contradicted by it, is not the real solution, that the cattle are bred because they can be exported, and would not be bred, or not to the same extent, if they could not?

In the last page will be found the exposure of the fallacy, much wrought on at the present moment, that it would be a burden on the country to disband soldiers, and a relief to take on more. Just as if the money saved by the disbandment, would not be employed by the owners in finding support for as many people somewhere else; with this remarkable difference, that the owners would have something for it in return.

The Preface is the only part on which any serious alteration can be suggested. It is completely true, that "*the rate of wages depends on the extent of the fund for the maintenance of labourers, compared with the number of labourers to be maintained.*" The rate, therefore, may manifestly be affected at two different ends; one by increasing or diminishing "the extent of the fund," and the other by increasing or diminishing "the number of labourers." The Corn Laws are the great engine by which "the fund" is voluntarily and artificially diminished; and the objection to the Preface is, that though it does not overlook the Corn Laws altogether, it does not put them into their due place. For instance, there is room for voting a point-blank amendment on the proposition that

'The principal cause of the calamities that we are witnessing, has been the disturbance which the Poor Laws, as at present administered in the South of England, have created in the most extensive and the most important of all political relations, the relation between the employer and the labourer.'—*p.* vi.

The principal cause is not in the Poor Laws, but the Corn Laws. If—to borrow from an illustration formerly employed—a number

of rats were caged up and supplied with a limited quantity of food, and encouraged to multiply till they starved each other by the subdivision of the allowance* ; a disturbance in the mode of feeding,—in the poor laws of the rat community,—might be the proximate cause of a tremendous uproar ; but there would be no doubt that the other, the shutting up, was the primary cause, and the cause on the removal of which the cessation of the evil would entirely depend. The greatest objection is therefore to be felt to the substitution of any palliatives for the removal of the primary cause. Let the primary cause be removed, or put in a course of gradual but certain extinction, and then palliate by as many ways as can be devised ; but till this is done, all palliatives lie under the predicament of tending to the preservation of the leading evil.

The palliative proposed at present, is to colonize ; in other words, to force the people of England to breed, as is done by the negroes in some of the West-Indian islands, for exportation. To which the direct answer is, that nobody has a right to make laws which shall force the people of England to transport themselves. They love their own country ; and will not have it made uninhabitable, to please the aristocracy. The plan of the landed aristocracy is this ; that England shall have no more corn than *they* shall sell, and then the competition for it will ensure nigh prices ; but to diminish the danger of resistance that might ensue, the people shall be taxed to pay for sending one another abroad. The transportation is to be the landlord's *valve ;* which shall prevent the machine from blowing up, but leave the owners as much pressure as without danger can be enjoyed. They will be content without *all* the pressure, because it is too dangerous ; but they will have as much as with safety can be left. They have taken all they dare from the people by the Corn Laws ; and now they come forward to say they want *twelve millions more*, to pay for carrying them into transportation. They have made the country untenable ; and now they want to tax the inhabitants, to carry them away. The English might be happy and increasing at home ; but it suits an overbearing "order" that they shall neither be happy nor increasing, and therefore they must pay twelve millions for being carried abroad. This plan of Emigration, so long as it is not preceded by an arrangement for the extinction of the Corn Laws, is a thing to be resisted *à l'outrance*,—which means with tooth and nail. If once the people of England submit to it, they will be the landlords'

* Art. on Free Trade, Westminster Review, 1 Jan. 1830, (p. 191 *of this Vol.*)

breeding cattle for ever and for ever. The manufacturing and commercial classes may give up all hope of breaking their chains ; and the country at large will settle down into one mass of slavery under the owners of the soil, hopeless because modified, and interminable because the oppressors have had the cunning to provide for the escape of what they would be unable to control.

In this state of things it is impossible not to impress upon the manufacturing and commercial interests, the importance of seizing the opportunity when their oppressors are embarrassed with the consequences of their oppression in the South, to come forward with united voices for the removal of the great national wrong. No man of common sense says, Because my enemy has his hands full, therefore I will wait till they are empty. No man in the common concerns of life, attends to the puling representations of a plunderer, that it would be unpleasant to him to be pressed just now, and therefore he hopes his pursuers will stay till it is more convenient to him. The master manufacturers are perfectly able to distinguish between the rights of property, and maintaining men in the power of taking other people's property. The operatives also, instead of squabbling, like the rats, for wages which the masters are prevented by law from being able to give, will join the universal cry of " We will not keep the landed aristocracy." How is a master to pay wages, if the landed aristocracy make a law against the goods being exchanged for what is wanted in return? The landlords are aware of their danger, and will undoubtedly push the Emigration scheme with all their might. And if they succeed, they will have

' Slipt the slave's collar on, and snapt the lock.'

The Correspondence and letters connected with the London Mechanics' Institution, are open to the same objection of substituting the proximate cause of the evil for the primary. They all dwell upon the means of diminishing the numbers in the cage, without adverting to the simple Act of Parliament by which the rats are caged at all. Thus when the President states that " Excess of population, absolute and relative, is the occasion of our recent and immediate oppression," he states what is irresistible and true. But when he proceeds to say " an excess the result of *peace*," he should have said " of the Corn Laws which followed upon the peace." The multitude, the rank and file, of the London Mechanics' Institution are begged to sift this difference. It certainly is to be lamented, that a mass of well-meaning Mechanics in Southampton Buildings should have unanimously come to a determination " that

there do not appear to be any natural and unforced means of profitably increasing the demand for labour in the United Kingdom to such an extent as to absorb the existing redundancy of the supply of labour,"—and have overlooked the fact, that the landlords have prohibited labour from being exchanged for the only things for which there is a demand.

Taxes, as they affect the labouring classes, may be divided into those which will be ultimately shifted upon the employers, and which therefore produce only a temporary operation on the labourers, *viz.* during the time in which the shift is taking place,—and those which act, and are intended to act, as a prohibition upon the exchange of labour in certain quarters where it would otherwise be effected. An instance of the first may be the tax on malt; the reduction of which will be a good to the labourers, only till their employers can find opportunity to screw them out of the amount by the reduction of their wages. It is not affirmed that this is not a good,—but that it is a fleeting good, and one of which the whole amount is never much. To represent it therefore as a *great* good to the labouring classes, would be a fraud; and if the labouring classes have been led to accept it as a *great* good, they have been deceived. Two years might perhaps be stated as the limit during which its operation may be sensible;—on the principle that in the variations consequent on one revolution of the seasons, the greatest part of the advantage to the labourers will be in some shape or other screwed out of their wages, and that anything that may be left the first year will be clean swept away in another. Of the other kind of taxes, the Corn Laws and other restrictions upon foreign trade are instances; and these fall on the labouring classes in the same way that the cage falls on the rats, and produce on them an effect whose magnitude exceeds beyond all proportion the positive amount of the taxation. The Resolutions therefore of the Mechanics are true of one species of taxation, and not the other.

Last in the course of examination, comes the History of "Swing;" an ominous name at this moment, though there was a time, the auto-biographer declares, when the Miss and Master Swings went to church with their hair pleasingly combed, like the family of any prime minister. The Life and History of Swing is a novel in the manner of Mrs. Hannah Moore's Cheap Repository; and like its predecessors, it is sometimes deficient in attention to probabilities, and accumulates on the head of the hero a greater number of remarkable events than are likely to fall to the share of an individual. But something of this kind appears to be inseparable from the character of a hero; for he could hardly be a hero, of whom nothing could be told but what

was common to mankind. The present hero was born of a small farmer, on the day on which Mr. Pitt became minister of England; which makes his age about forty-seven. He was intended for college, but his elder brother dying, he took to his father's business instead; and, on the strength probably of his academical prepossessions, married the curate's daughter. His landlord dies; and is succeeded by an heir who has no care for Swing, and turns his farm into a fox-cover. On being remonstrated with, the landlord replies, that every man can do what he pleases with his own. Upon which it may be observed, that though landlords may do what they please with their own, it is extremely hard that they should do what they please with what is not their own; and particularly that they should prohibit other men from selling the produce of their labour, and thereby bring on the state of things which condemns a discharged tenant to starve. Swing, however, starves as he needs must. He makes various efforts to escape, as the caged rats do in like circumstances; and after selling his stock and cattle at a loss, to support his family, he tries to maintain himself by working as a gardener.

'Up to this period I had never attended a political meeting in my life, nor took any part whatever in politics; I thought our laws and legislators too good to require alteration or change; and if I hated one thing more than another, it was Radicalism, the abettors of which I considered no better than rebels and revolutionists, who wanted to destroy our glorious constitution, and cause anarchy in the country. I began, however, now to think otherwise. I had seen all around me, my neighbours reduced from comfort to poverty, and from poverty to the poor-rates; and as, in the greater number of cases, it had arisen from no fault of their own, it occurred to me that some change was necessary; as had England been governed as it ought, those things could never have taken place. Reflections of this sort determined me to attend the great meeting at Manchester, then about to be held, and I accordingly went there. Everything passed quietly off until noon, when, to my horror and surprise, a charge was made by the military and yeomanry on the peaceable and unarmed multitude that were assembled, and I, amongst others, was wounded by a sabre-cut in the arm. Bleeding profusely, and with my arm hanging useless by my side, I went into Manchester and got it dressed; I was kept awake the entire night by the pain of my wound, but consoled myself with the reflection that immediate and condign punishment would be inflicted on the lawless soldiery who had dared to massacre a peaceable multitude assembled to petition Parliament. "The King," said I, "will certainly send down a commission to have the monsters tried for their blood-thirsty outrage." What was my astonishment and indignation, in ten days after, when I saw a letter from the Secretary of State, thanking in the King's name, the military and magistrates, for massacring the people at Manchester.'

'I no longer wanted a proof that our country was sadly misgoverned,—that a great change was necessary,—and that the Reformers were the only real friends of the people.'—*p.* 4.

There are parts of this, that would do no discredit to De Foe. The unfortunate ex-collegian (if he can be called *ex* who never was *in*) gets well of his arm, but unhappily employs it in picking up a partridge, and finds himself once more at issue with his enemies. He goes the ordinary course, which all mankind must do who pick up partridges. He gets free after six months, and is just in time to meet a demand upon his garden for two years' tithes. The tithes devour his cow; and new claims of the same kind send him to be harnessed to the parish cart, that last scene where "the envy of surrounding nations" are ground down into increased rents for the framers of the Corn Laws. In his wrath he writes a threatening letter, and signs it "Swing." The curate's daughter dies, as she had better have done before. His children crawl under a stack for shelter, and set it on fire by accident; and the next morning finds the neighbourhood filled with charges against "Swing."

A publication of this kind must have vast effect in carrying through a country the sense of wrong, and the eager desire to get rid of it. And the government must be of extraordinary mould, which at such a period engages itself in contests with the press at the instigation of political rivals, instead of applying itself to the reduction of the causes of complaint. A Bourbon government made an aide-de-camp wait twenty minutes, while Paris was filled with strife; the rule of three will give the policy of waiting for three months. From the landlords there is little to expect. They will sacrifice all and everybody, for the smallest chance of putting off the evil day. At present, they seem to look on the church as the first victim; and there are only the fundholders to come next. If the revenues of the church are attacked to save the landlords, the man who holds funded property afterwards, deserves what he will get. Either this Polyphemus of the landed interest must be got the better of, or the only consolation left for anybody will be to be eaten last.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 January, 1831.

ART. XVII.—*Tableau de la Pologne, ancienne et moderne, publié en un volume par Malte-Brun. Nouvelle édition, entièrement refondue, augmentée et ornée de cartes; par Léonard Chodzko.* 2 Vols. —Paris. 1830.

IN the years 1788 and 1789 the attention of Europe was attracted by the apparition of a "Constituent Diet" in Poland, and a "Constituent Assembly" in France, both of them formed for the avowed purpose of improving the condition of the lower and middle classes of society by legislative alterations. The Polish diet proceeded to the emancipation of the agricultural labourers; which, only eight years before, had been resisted with as much virulence as the emancipation of the same classes in the British colonies is opposed by the slave-holders. In France too the necessity for alteration, though not amounting ostensibly to all that is conveyed in the term serf or slave, was scarcely less absolute in fact. It was clear that there was an intention to promote the happiness of mankind; and therefore it was time for their enemies to be everywhere on foot. How the three barbarian powers of the East of Europe united to attack Poland and France;—how the fourth in the West, the English absolutists, joined them in the part of the plan which lay within their reach;—how the united robbers, after a sallad of murder and *Te Deums*, of conflagrations and general fasts, succeeded in dividing Poland, but did not succeed in dividing France;—how gloriously they were beaten, and with the exception of one of the guilty parties (on whom, for some inscrutable reason, Providence had mercy) were visited with just and thank-worthy humiliation in their capitals;—how the nation, and the leader, whom the same Providence in its goodness had raised to be the instruments of its just punishments, *forgot Poland*, and by the direct consequences of that unhappy act were within a little year subjected to the Holy confederated plunderers themselves;—how the world rolled on for fifteen years, and fools thought the crime was clinched and riveted; and what sufferings and miseries fell upon mankind, and above all upon the gulled and guilty nation who had sinned in the face of the most light and knowledge of the whole;—how men were starved here and ruined there, and society seemed doomed to exist in a hopeless agony, which was not life but never closed in death;—how this went on accumulating, till all at once light sprang from the bayonets of Paris, and justice, which robbers call revolution, was once more afoot and conquering from Toulouse to the Tartar;—how all the world divided itself into two parts, the honest men and the dishonest,

and no question was asked of any man, but which side he chose to take;—all these are things our schoolboys know and babies sing of, and it would be lost time to enter on the detail, with any grown man or woman who has lived within the sound of tongues or reach of rumour.

There is now only one question; *Will Europe desert Poland?* If she does, it is simple charity and pure unmingled meek humanity to pray that she may be subjected for another half century, to baser barbarians if they can be found, to more ensanguined hypocrites if the earth can breed them, than those who have borne sway and rioted in all her quarters for the last. If what is past has not demonstrated the true intent and bearing of arbitrary governments, or has been insufficient to unite mankind in terror of their tender mercies and horror of their piety, there must of necessity be more; and charity is to wish it quick and over, that the world at some time may begin to flourish and to breathe. In all the various nations of Europe, insular or continental, every individual, except the combined for plunder, has deeply suffered and is now suffering, for the passive guilt of submission to that scheme of flagrant wrong, of which the spoliation of Poland was the beginning, and its promised restoration is the end. Will these individuals,—in their several spheres and capacities, and as God shall give them grace and power,—unite for the purpose of securing that great Act of Abolition of European slavery, the re-establishment of independent Poland as a barrier against the barbarians of the East? Is there any inhabitant of the British Islands,—to limit the application to a single quarter,—who does not see that the power of Russia has been appealed to for the purpose of cutting off and diminishing his own liberties, and that the magnitude and security of his enjoyments fluctuate in exact inverse proportion to the influence of the other? It is not that there is any animosity against Russia. Russia is as yet intrinsically barbarian; somebody must be last in the progress of civilization, and it happens to be Russia. Her government is centuries behind those of most of the other European nations, in all that is acknowledged to constitute the existence of a good or desirable government. And for this very reason it is, that she is courted and appealed to, by the supporters of misgovernment in all quarters of the globe. It might be thought hard if the Portuguese and Spanish constitutionalists had sent to Russia, to say they did not entirely approve her government and beg she would alter it. But by what right is the barbarian power permitted to act the converse, and to send to men congregated for freedom in the West of Europe, the assurances of her high dislike and meditated enmity? The snare is too

manifest; our enemies fight us with the barbarians; civilized Europe therefore must be against the barbarians, and join in one effort to drive them back "to their frightful deserts." There let them remain, and learn from Europe all they can towards the improvement of their patrimony; but let Europe be freed from the nuisance of their interference. The Russians are to Europe, precisely what the Persian empire was to Greece; a people in an inferior state of civilization, pressing forward on a people in a superior, backed by huge numbers and the treacherous aid of all that is opposed to liberty within. The serviles would bring the Chinese upon us, if the Chinese could fight; the Brother of the Sun and Moon would be a "magnanimous sovereign," if there was any chance of his mountebank soldiers being brought to Brussells. The simple plan of the lovers of arbitrary power all over the earth, is to keep down the civilized people by the help of the barbarians. It is for this reason that Austria is to have Italy; and it is for this reason that civilized man in every village thoughout Europe, has risen or will rise, to effect the liberation of his species. Treaties are but the bonds with which the victims have been tied; let those that made them look to them, but do not tell the Samson who has just burst his withes, that these were the obligations which engage him to lie still. Most of the governments in Europe have been the people's enemies; and those which are not, will put themselves at the head of the people's movement and be safe. Men have penetrated everywhere the mean fraud by which arbitrary governments protested against revolutionists and levellers, while themselves were the great up-turners of all right and levellers of all security. The universal feeling towards them is hatred mixed with scorn; a compound which those who taste of, seldom prosper after.

It seems impossible that a nation like the French, fond of honourable distinction and smarting under the recollection of fifteen years' suffering in the form of a lieutenant of the barbarians in their capital, should decline to seize the opportunity put into their hands, of going down the page of history as the liberators of mankind. They have drunk deeply of every scorn that barbarism could invent; not an individual of thirty millions who has not, either in his own person or his friends, paid the heavy poll-tax which uncivilized man levies on his civilized neighbour when unfortunate circumstances give him the power of abuse. The French have all the qualities for putting themselves at the head of the μισοβάρβαροι* of Europe; their brethren in every land that is threatened by the savage and

* "Barbarian-haters." From Xenophon's μισοπέρσην. *Agesil.*

the slave, hold out their hands, saying "Come and help us." They are courted to be the great nation, by a continent of hope. No ambition, except of virtue! no aggrandisement beyond the Rhine, except the aggrandisement of placing free Italy and Poland between themselves and the barbarian! The French know that they exist but on sufferance; that they are abstained from, only till the despots see opportunity to renew the march to Paris. Either the French cause must prevail, or the despots; in such a contest there is no middle term; and the statesman who should dream of sitting down in some intermediate snuggery, may be a good father of a family, a kind master, and die at last with all the comforts of the confessional about him, but had better not charge himself with the responsibility of a country's safety.

And what, after all, is the principle of non-interference, but a composition with oppressors from whom men are glad to obtain half because they cannot get the whole? No man puts forward the principle of non-interference with plunderers on the high road, except on those limited occasions where he may look forward to being able to resist but not to suppress. And what would be the consequence in common life, if the principle of non-interference was acknowledged and acted on?—if there might be a Holy Alliance of thieves, but only a Non-Interference Society of honest men? Nobody would submit to such folly except in politics. If the contents of a man's pockets have been divided among sanctified cutpurses, the whole community of men with pockets rises up and recovers the booty first, and then applies itself to speculate on the various degrees of preventional infliction, from the fivefold retribution of Moses, to the gallows or the guillotine. If the despotic states of Europe had never dreamed of interfering with the others,—if they had notoriously eschewed anything like banding themselves together, and had established a character for self-denial in all that regarded their neighbours' concerns,—there would be a strong objection to any combination against them by the rest. But when their conduct has been ostentatiously the reverse of all this,—and when they have puffed and blown in the face of heaven, and wrought themselves out of breath with calling upon all the persons in the Trinity to witness that they were united as one flesh to put down all that was in opposition to their ideas of government in other countries,—it would be simply a copy of the fraud which should tell a back-gammon player that all sixes were to tell upon one side but not the other. As poor Napoleon once said, there must be *some chances* against legitimates as well as other people. All that goes against this is part of the great fraud—the "grand *hum*," as a Dean, who

ought to have been a bishop, once said, in pointing to his Doctor's scarlet in a confidential moment,—a portion of the universal atmosphere of conspiracy, in the midst of which the people everywhere move and have their being. Is there any man, in the House of Commons for example, or elsewhere, who laying aside all forms of nonsense, and appeals to gone-by foolery, will come forward and fairly pledge himself to the assertion, that it is meet and right that the barbarous powers should combine against the civilized when it suits their purposes, and that it is not meet and right that the civilized should unite against the barbarians when they can? Or is there any who will advance, that the three robber powers of the continent are to cover and secure their robberies by a compact against freedom everywhere, and that free men throughout Europe are not bound by individual honour and general interest to start up like the dead at the last trumpet, and demand the execution of justice and the restoration of nations? What right has Austria to Italy; and what was any treaty by which former ministers acceded to the cession, but a bargain with one plunderer, for the interest of another? The people of England were the parties really made war upon, from the first junction of English ministers with the Holy Allies in 1792 to the termination in 1815. It is we who were the down-trodden; and it is we who now intend to be up. Give us Poland; our sufferings began with Poland, and with Poland they shall end. The beggar in the streets,—the man who is to be hanged for rick-burning,—is son and heir to the spoliation of Poland, and would not have been where he is, but for the principles which enabled a British ministry to join *twice* in that act of baseness. And exactly as that is undone, will our recovery move hand in hand. If the Russians are driven over the Niemen, we shall have the Ballot; if they cross the Dnieper, we shall be rid of the Corn Laws; and if the Poles can get Smolensko, we too in our taxes shall get back to the ground of 1686. The world looks to France; she shall be the great nation for ever and for ever, if she will but proclaim the restoration of the Europe of 1772, and send each of the robbers a tri-coloured flag as a notice to quit. Have not they insulted her, have not they trampled on her, have not they ridden over her with Cossacks and all manner of wild beasts, for no earthly reason but because she had driven back their Duke of Brunswick in 1792, and answered the invasion in each and every of their capitals; and why and for what reason, should any honest man in France or elsewhere, not wish, hope, and ardently aspire after seeing her the instrument of the world's retribution? Some will call this "sounding the tocsin of war." The tocsin of war is to have two

tongues ; one of brass, when the despots and the barbarians are to be gathered together, and another of felt, when the civilized races are to take measures for their mutual support. The civilized people are to sit down and see themselves conquered in detail ; while barbarity is to have a free-masonry of fellowship all over the earth, and constitute one agency with a single end. There never was so large a demand made on human folly at one swoop before ; mankind may have been feeble, but there is no precedent for expecting such debility as this.

But to the English individually, there is a reason closer than political,—a reason which comes home to every man's basket and to his store, and which should engage his liveliest exertions, as it will the keenest opposition of his domestic enemies. Poland is God Almighty's granary ; it is the place where ought to be grown the millions of quarters of corn, and thousands of millions of quartern loaves, which should be dropping into the mouths of the children who are starving for want of them, and which do not drop, because the landholders stand by with a six-pounder, to fire on the fathers of those children if they attempt to procure them by the exchange of their manufacturing industry. All Poland might be covered with English cottons, and all England fattened with Polish corn ; but one selfish and overbearing order jumps upon the cross-road, and swears with cocked pistols that not a bit shall take place of either. It was for this purpose that wars have been carried on since 1792. We have been buried with debt, as a preliminary to being starved. That *you*—and *you*—and *you*—might die in holes and corners, and somebody else ride thereby on fat horses, has been the object, end, and conclusion, of the long turmoil of war and warlike energies. At last, however, we have come to a point. We have got a ministry which avows that all is not right, and something shall be mended. What it will do, is matter of much doubt. Among other symptoms, it has taken to its prayers. Not that respectable kind of prayer, in which an honest man calls upon God and Saint *Frappe-fort*, while he is taking all earthly means to compass his deliverance ; but that by which a man should put off the correction of his accounts from month's end to month's end, and set somebody to pray that in the mean time they might be going right. The precedent is a most alarming one ; past ministers never prayed, but when the people were to be led into some suffering ; and the ministry that promises reform has directed the process, without considering that there is no previous ground on which to attach a hope. How will the form run ? Will it begin " O Lord, who hast permitted the landholders—" And will it go on,

" Pour into their hearts such a sense of the error of their ways" —" that they may consider their latter end"—" or ever they are swallowed up quick"—" and we thy servants and sheep of thy pasture"—" in all godly quietness,"—" for ever and ever, Amen"? This is not the composition of a professional person; but it is great odds if the professional men compose a better. The probability is that the ministry wish to direct the thoughts of all hearers into this channel, though they could not exactly dictate words to the ecclesiastical authorities. A member of the legislature has at the same time come forward with a proposal for a General Fast; it would have been more germane to the matter if he had offered the people a day's keep. What *can* a General Fast have to do with the removal of the Corn Laws; unless the higher classes are going to make the experiment of how they like it? The landholders have proclaimed a general fast for the industrious orders these fifteen years; and now they are going to give them a form for Grace after Meat. But the industrious orders have set their imaginations upon bread; they think on the crust and on the crumb, and will not be deterred from taking it where it can honestly be had. If they have common sense they will write on their banners when they make a pageant, " Free Poland and Free Bread." The writer of this remembers, when he thought there was some blunder in the connexion constantly maintained between the cries for political reform and bread. But time has taught him better; he has found out and penetrated, that the spirit of political corruption is only another name for the love of a neighbour's goods, and that as the goods of a poor man are his children's bread, it is on this that the dishonesty of the rich always falls. The connexion is as real and as intimate, as the connexion between the angle and the versed sine. The plot of the monopolists in all quarters is, that they shall live sumptuously on the bread of the poor; and they think to get over it, by giving back twopence in the pound in flannel petticoats. This is the truth; and because it is the truth, it ought to be said in all corners, sung in all highways, and painted at the bottom of all vessels to honour or to dishonour, where it may have a chance to catch the eye and impress the mind. Poland has its liberation to win, and so have we. We have both of us fallen among thieves; and we cannot do better than carry on the contest in concert.

Programme to the Westminster Review for 1 April, 1831.

THE Westminster Review has been characterised as "the periodical of the middle classes." The estimate is not far from correct, if it is necessary to fix on a part of the community whose interests are peculiarly concerned in its progress. Its principal object has been, and is, to prove to the middle classes, and to the higher also, (with the possible exception of such individuals as may have been born to the power of providing for their children from the public purse), that they have been under a huge mistake in believing they were to receive any real and ultimate advantage, from those acts of legislative oppression which the absence of all fair representation has enabled them to inflict on the industrious and the poor. It is not denied that they *did* gain;—it is not controverted, that when they had persuaded the poorer classes that they had nothing to do with the laws but to obey them, they directed the machine to their own immediate advantage, with the short-sighted cunning appropriate to their project. But what is intended to be maintained is, that the time when they could gain is gone by;—that like men who have sold themselves to the evil spirit, their period of enjoyment is run out, and they have nothing before them but a fearful looking-for of consequences, unless grace is given them to escape by repentance and amendment of their ways; and that this consummation is coming fast upon them, not by the vengeance of the sufferers, but by the natural connexion it has pleased heaven to establish between injustice and final pain. It is not the fault of the sufferers, if when the landlords have prohibited the exchange of manufacturing industry in an attempt to pin the barometer to a high price of food, they find out that their device is but a blunder after all, and that Providence has ways and means of reaching them in spite of their monkey-like ingenuity. It is not the fault of the suffering classes, if the clergy, (who, to speak of them collectively, can certainly not be ranked among the opponents of the system which has produced the general ill), find that their reward is, to have their possessions threatened as the first sacrifice to the failure of the landlords' plan,—or if the fundholders, (who have been also held out as among the supporters of the things that be), discover themselves to be only reserved for the last morsels of the landed Polypheme. It is not the deed of the Westminster Review either, that this is true; nor will it be deterred, or swayed, from standing, while it can stand, between the living and the dead, and calling upon the middle classes, and those above them, to look to the storm before it

breaks, and to take such reasonable measures as, whether they succeed or fail, shall be remembered with satisfaction afterwards. There are no quack medicines for the consequences of a nation's unguarded hours; the escape, if there be any, must in the phraseology of scripture, be with the skin of the teeth; but to see and know the danger, is at all events the first step towards such relief as may be practicable.

It is no vain boast, that the Westminster Review enjoys an extensive share of the confidence of the poorer and most suffering portions of the community. Why should it not? has it anything to get by wronging them? If it were to chuse its own disciples by personal predilections merely, there would be not many rich, not many great, among its followers. But it is for the sake of the good which may be done to the first,—without rejecting what may arise to the others also,—that it addresses itself to the deceived rich, to the defrauded master of thousands, to the oppressed owner of a hundred looms, to the threatened ecclesiastic, the tottering fund-holder, and above all to the injured land-owner who has the sense to see that it may be possible to make the price of corn high by others' wrong and still he may be poor. The appeal therefore is made to the men of one thousand a-year, who ought to be men of two; or, which comes to the same thing, who ought to enjoy their thousand without having half of it deducted that a fragment of the proceeds may dribble into the pockets of a few. There is no war against wealth; the war is between those who ought to have wealth, and those who ought not to have it. The question is whether industry in all its ranks and gradations shall defend its just gains, or shall acknowledge itself to be the born thrall of those whose main plea for consideration is that they never worked at all. The country, as has been justly remarked, is rapidly "dividing itself into two parts, the *conservative* and the *revolutionary*,"—the party who wish to keep what is their own, and the party who wish to take it from them. It is on its steady and consistent attachment to the interests of the first of these classes, that the Westminster Review has ever founded its claims to the attention of the public.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 April, 1831.

ART. I.—*Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland.* Vols. I. and II.—Parbury, Allen, and Co., London. Dondey Dupré et fils, Paris. 1824-1830.

FEW individuals have not, either in their sleeping or waking hours, entertained the idea of the effect of entering a new world, where the physical and moral results of creative power

should be found displayed under novel forms, though with sufficient attention to general laws to be intelligible to a visitor from our planet. Very much like this is the consequence of viewing the manners, thoughts, and actions, of the inhabitants of remote regions, who have struck out distinct paths to the formation of society, and have made progress in arts, literature, or science, by processes of their own, which though necessarily often coincident in the results, present the luxury of divergence by the way. Europe is tired of the repetition of *Mars, Bacchus, Apollo, virorum.* There is scarcely an inlet to the existing knowledge of this quarter of the globe, all the circumstances and agents connected with which are not familiar to satiety. It is pleasant to know what kind of letters were invented, by anybody but Cadmus; and to obtain the poetry of any people upon earth, where it can be certain there has been no communication with the Muses Nine. Anacreon has given way to Moore and Béranger; but it is still interesting to know how men get tipsy by moonlight in Japan. The props of church and state are grotesque enough at home; but they sink into dullness, compared with the rich absurdities which flourish in the atmosphere of China. Nor is the search confined to the ludicrous and the gay. It is gratifying to see the wisdom of one hemisphere confirmed by the good sense of another; and to make acquaintance with the better feelings of mankind, as they have expanded in unthought-of shapes, like the host of new charities that encompass the man who visits the descendants of the same father in a distant land.

It is in Asia that novelties of this kind are to be expected; for the progress of Africa has been small, and America has little left that has not been screwed into the European model. In Asia too, (with the inclusion of Egypt, which it would be no great step to set down as an Indian colony), are found the earliest works of human skill, and the finest specimens of the pickled follies of antiquity. If marks of wisdom and benevolence sometimes present themselves, it is useful to observe how far they are outnumbered by monuments of the *instinct moutonnier* of mankind,—the propensity to believe without reason, and to obey without an end,—the misery and debasement which have followed in all ages, when masses of human beings have given themselves up to the guidance of privileged orders, and allowed themselves to be moulded into the forms which suited the interests of their masters. What a pleasant aristocratical invention was *caste**,—for those who

* It is remarkable that this term, though recognized by the natives of India who are conversant with Europeans, as being applied with accuracy to the objects

were to be the well bred. How grateful to a sacerdotal college must have been the sight of the manifold arms of Vishnu dispersing themselves over underground acres, or a pyramid raising to the clouds the evidence of the slavery and submission of the builders. There is nothing new under the sun, except forms. Servility does not now take the pyramidical; and jobs in architecture have ceased in the present age to be conducted under ground.

The first Memoir in these Volumes is "concerning the Chinese;" by J. F. Davis, Esq. China is one great caricature of a church-and-state government; where men think according to law, and "impure doctrines" are settled by the Emperor. The history of such a people is worth tracing. Their own statements of their antiquity go back to a period which may be almost called indefinite; but, as the sage *Choo-foo-tsze* has himself observed, "it is impossible to give entire credit to the traditions of these remote ages." The person salled *Fo-hi* is referred to as the author of all institutions and inventions which can be traced to nobody else; and in all countries hings of this description have been invented by *Fo-hi*. A little before the time of Abraham, *Chuen-hiŏ* regulated the calendar, and desired to begin the year on the first day of the month in which the sun should be nearest the 15th degree of Aquarius *; for which he is called the author and father of the

designated thereby, is still considered by them as of European origin. Such at least was the result of the inquiries of the writer. But on asking how what the English would call "Brahman caste" would be expressed in India, the answer was "*Brahmanka zât;*" the last being the Arabic word ذات "nature, kind," under an Indian pronunciation, and *ka* the affix indicating the genitive case in the word preceding. Have the sounds *ka zât* taken together, been corrupted by Europeans into *caste?* *Zât* (sometimes pronounced *jât*) appears to be the common word for "caste" throughout India; though the more genuine Hindî term is stated to be *gote* or *gotra*. Possibly there is a confusion between the word of Arabic origin, and some other that approaches to it in sound and meaning. The Sanscrit term is understood to be *beren*.

* Is the 15th degree mentioned in the original; or is it only the European expression for the middle of the sign? What is the general evidence for the antiquity of the division of the circle into 360 degrees, and of the degree into 60 minutes? Is it likely that it existed in ancient Egypt? Did Pythagoras, perchance, import it thence? The writer of this, once paced the distance between the two stone pyramids of Dashour, which lie nearly north and south from each other, with their faces to the cardinal points; and found the distance between the prolongations of the nearest sides of the bases to be forty yards more than a geometrical mile. If the sand should have accumulated about the bases, the original distance may have been a geometrical mile within a small error. Did the builders intend to authenticate that they had measured a minute of the earth's circumference, and consequently (assuming it to be a circle) the whole? Were the earliest pyramids the gnomons, from whose noonday shadows they calculated the sun's meridional altitudes at the summer and winter solstices, the mean of which would give the complement of the latitude, and half their difference the obliquity of the ecliptic; and having thus determined the difference of latitude of two pyramids and compared it with the distance in cubits, did they apply the knowledge so gained, to determining the

Ephemeris. He chose the time when the sun passes through the middle of the sign, "because in this season the earth is

site of other pyramids which should tell the story? What pyramids are there, north and south from each other, and at distances sufficiently great for the commencement of such a process? For example, the pyramids of Sakârah are north from those of Dashour, and within sight, with an interval of eight or ten miles. Are any others of the pyramids a geometrical mile from each other? Are there any that are sixty or a degree? Are there any pyramids whose latitudes might suggest the idea of their having been placed on that precise latitude by design? For instance, is not the second pyramid of Jîzah (by the observations of the French army, See *Décade Egyptienne*, Vol. iii. p. 102.) within a few seconds of the latitude of 30°? The brick pyramid at Dashour [the only one in Egypt; Lord Byron was wrong when he said "brick mountains"] lies east from the southernmost of the two of stone. What is the distance; and has it any connexion with the mensuration of a minute of longitude in the latitude of the place? Is it, *par hasard*, the fraction of a geometrical mile which is represented by the cosine of the latitude divided by radius; which in the latitude of Dashour would be about eighty-seven hundredths? Had the Egyptians been trying to ascertain, whether the length of a degree of longitude in their latitude, accorded with the supposition of the earth's being a sphere? There would be no difficulty in doing this, within limits which would at all events be gratifying; by taking the mean result of repeated observations of the time of day from the length of morning or evening shadows, at two stations east and west from each other at the greatest distance that admitted of a communication by signal. Or the immersion of a star behind a north and south wall at each station might answer the same purpose, if the experimenters were able to raise a flash of light visible for fifteen or twenty miles, and had anything of the nature of a clepsydra or minute-glass capable of determining with some degree of accuracy the interval between the immersions at the two stations. It is not necessary to suppose that pyramids were built solely to commemorate such observations as these; but when for some reason pyramids were to be built, there is no difficulty in supposing the opportunity might be taken to commemorate the observations. Also will anybody standing on the side of the northernmost pyramid at Dashour, see if there is not a hill bearing E. N. E. by compass, at the distance of three or four miles, which has much the appearance of a worn-out (or as the French would say, *dégradé*) pyramid; and moreover whether it is on the east or west side of the Nile? There are pyramids of this kind in Egypt, which passed for hills till Mr. Salt ascertained them to be pyramids; but Mr. Salt said, there never was a pyramid found on the east side of the Nile. If, therefore, one is discovered from Dashour, it will be a curiosity.

In the confidence that this may fall into the hands of some of the numerous travellers returning from India by Egypt, it may be excusable to add some other questions, though confessedly divagations. Does not some curiosity attach to specimens of the *enchorial* hand; or that which appears among the three inscriptions on the Rosetta stone, and is neither Greek nor hieroglyphic? If so, there are inscriptions in it on the rocks near the Pasha's new well at Hamâmah the great halting-place between Cosseir and Kenneh. In a recess in the rock, about an English mile on the side of Hamâmah towards Cosseir, and on the southern side of the road (or left hand coming from Cosseir) is a surface of perhaps thirty feet long and fifteen high, cut in the native granite, and covered with representations of Egyptian ceremonies, in low relief, in a more finished style, and on a finer material, than any others afterwards observed in Egypt. The vacant spaces are filled with inscriptions in Greek, among which appear the dates of Tiberius, Nero, and Domitian, being manifestly the work of Græco-Egyptian soldiers in the Roman service, who have taken the opportunity to commemorate their own names and those of the captains of their companies; plainly marking this as having been the Roman halting-place, or at all events the site of its out-post, on the road to Berenice or whatever was the Roman station on the Red Sea. One name only, ΓΑΙΟϹ ΠΕΤΙΚΙΟϹ, appears in another place, as CAIUS PETICIUS; from which it may be concluded that Caius Peticius was a Roman by birth. His name, in

adorned with plants, trees renew their verdure, and all nature seems reanimated;" which of course means the spring season.

---

its Roman dress, has been faintly scratched on the eternal granite with the point of some tool like a pick-axe, and then the letters completed by blows of the point; and when Caius Peticius came to the second I, he appears to have been called away, and has left the remaining letters a barely distinguishable scrawl. Among other productions of these military artists is a figure of a galley, bearing on the prow a machine which may be supposed to be the *corvus*; and on the poop the captain's head, in the proportions usually attributed to that of King Charles in the oak. The position of the oars, though not so distinct as might be desired, favours the idea that there were several tiers, pulled by rowers at different altitudes, as would be represented by supposing a modern ship of war of several decks to put out sweeps at her different tiers of ports. The probability is, that this recess was the position of the advanced post; and that the regular halting-place was at Hamâmah. In confirmation of which the Aga of Kenneh produced an earthern canteen, of the figure of a flattened spheroid, with holes or loops for carrying it by means of a cord passing round the edge of the lower circumference; which was found at the depth of above a hundred feet in digging the present well, proving that an extensive well had existed there in times gone by.

These figures and inscriptions are well known to the Arabs of the road; who call them مكتوبات *maktûbât*, "writings," and تصاوير *tasâwîr*, "drawings." Denon and his companions appear to have ridden by them without notice; but the place is mentioned by Capt. Hanson. It is perhaps a hundred yards from this recess, on the side of Cosseir, that are found the specimens of the *enchorial* hand before alluded to. The inscriptions observed were two; each occupying a space of perhaps ten inches long and five deep, divided into three or four compartments by horizontal lines. The writer of this attempted to copy them with the black powder of antimony used by the Arabs for their eyes; but failed. He afterwards sent an Arab servant from Kenneh, furnished with a bottle of country ink, and a ball of leather stuffed with cotton; who was directed to bring away a dozen impressions of each, by covering the surface of the rock with ink, and applying wet paper of the thin kind called in India "*over-land*." The Arab rejoined at Monfalut; bringing with him perfect copies, not of the enchorial inscriptions intended, but of two small collections of hieroglyphics, of about the same external dimensions. These copies were sent to the late Dr. Young, and it has been understood that he said they contained the name of a new Egyptian king; but more is not known. As the locality of these rests only on the authority of the Arab, if they are seen it would be worth while to copy them. Any traveller trying the method above mentioned of copying small inscriptions, will find it exceedingly effective; and by bringing away a multitude of copies, the defects of one may be corrected from another. On the opposite side of the road are many rude representations of animals, wild and tame; with some inscriptions, but not larger than may be supposed to contain the names of passengers.

Will any military traveller also examine the remains of forts, and small square towers, which are found on the road from Cosseir to Kenneh; and say whether they have not the appearance of being built for the purpose of operating with fire-arms against an enemy advancing from the Red Sea? There is a fort of this kind (mentioned also by Capt. Hanson), capable of containing several hundred men, about twenty miles from Cosseir, called by the Arabs *Sâleh*. It is situated precisely where the country begins to be closed by the mountains; and commands the flat sandy road that approaches from the Red Sea. Probably it is one of those described by citizen *Bachelu*, (*Décade Egyptienne*, vol. iii. p. 257). The small square towers on the rocks in other parts of the road, all have what a sailor would call "a long reach" before them on the side towards the Red Sea; and seem intended for the action of the small long pieces of artillery employed in the early periods of the use of gunpowder. The probability from these circumstances would appear to be, that they were constructed by the Sultans of Egypt at the time when they were threatened by

But *Chuen-hiŏ* made the mistake of finding the spring season in the middle of December; as appears by calculation of the precession of the equinoxes. Astronomical observations are great enemies of the marvellous. In fact astronomy seems to have been created, that inventors in the dark ages might have their dishonesty exposed.

The only direct testimony, *out* of China, relating to the origin of the Chinese nation, appears to be in the Institutes of Menu; where it is written, that "many families of the military class, having gradually abandoned the ordinances of the Veda, and the company of Brahmans, lived in a state of degradation, as the *Chinas* and some other nations."

'The great antiquity of the laws of Menu is in favour of the authenticity of the above testimony; for at the period at which Sir W. Jones supposes them to have been written (above one thousand years B. C.), there can be no doubt whatever but the Chinese nation was yet in its infancy and that it could lay no claim to the character of an extensive, united, and powerful empire, until many centuries after that date.'—vol. i. p. 3.

The *Empire* of China cannot be dated earlier than the dynasty called *Tsin*, about two hundred years before Christ.

'*Chi-hoang-ti*, the *First Emperor*, as his name seems to import, had hardly established his authority, when the Tartars, or barbarians of the north, began to make incursions over the extensive frontiers. The Emperor succeeded in driving them back into their deserts, and then employed the united resources of his dominions in the erection of the vast Wall, which has existed during a space of two thousand years, and remains to this day a stupendous, though nearly useless, monument of the ambitious disposition of this prince*. As if deter-

---

Albuquerque and the Portuguese from the Red Sea. At a place called *Fayákhir* فياخر in the rear of these, are the vestiges of what has probably been a barrack for the reception of the troops of the support. At this last place also, was the first observed specimen of Egyptian architecture; in the shape of a small shrine or temple, like what in some parts of India is called a "Puttur."

Lastly, will anybody ascertain with precision, whether the figure of the *cobra de capello* or hooded snake does not appear as a mortuary emblem in the Egyptian tombs and temples, and notably at Dendera, the *Bîbân ul Muluk* or "Tombs of the Kings" at Gournou, and at Hou; sometimes in the large representations of snakes which surround the rooms, but oftener in the shape of an ornament on the heads of the human figures attendant on the dead? Remains of antiquity have been discovered at Hou since Denon's visit. They are about three-quarters of a mile from the river, and are shown by the Arabs under the title of *Hajar*, "stones." The *cobra de capello* appears as the symbol of destructive power in the *Trimurti* or Indian Trinity at Elephanta. Is not its appearance in Egypt a proof that the Egyptian ceremonies came from India?

* 'The substance of the Great Wall, which extends along a space of 1,500 miles, from the shore of the Yellow Sea to Western Tartary, has been estimated by Mr. Barrow to exceed in quantity that of all the houses in Great Britain, and to be capable of surrounding the whole earth with a wall several feet high.'

mined, however, to have a counterpoise to the reputation which this great work entitled him to, or influenced by a spirit not unlike that by which Erostratus was inspired when he burned the Ephesian temple, the same Emperor issued a general order that all the books of the learned should be cast into the flames. Though a great many, of course, escaped this sweeping sentence, his memory is execrated by the literati of China.'—*p.* 6.

The most reasonable solution would seem to be, that the works of the literati were not found to promote the building of the wall; and therefore the general order may be considered as equivalent to a Chinese "Six Acts." What convicted fools nations are, when they allow either one man or five hundred, to set up a right to waste their money and destroy their books!

'It is stated in the history of that period, that Japan was colonized from China during the same dynasty; and there appears to myself some ground for giving credit to the record.—I am well aware that the Japanese have been asserted by some to have peopled their islands as early as the 13th century before Christ, and that those people are said to disdain the very idea of being descended from the Chinese. If, however, we remark the striking similarity that exists between the persons, the manners, the dispositions, and the policy of the two nations, we cannot but recognize them to be of *one family;* and the fact of the Japanese making use of the Chinese written language, and reverencing the books of Confucius, may fairly be considered as evidence that they carried them from China, at, or some time previous to, the period in question.'—*p.* 6.

This extract is made for the sake of noticing the curious fact, that in different branches of the Chinese family, the same written characters express the same ideas, but with different sounds according to the diversities of spoken language. The nearest practical illustration that can be offered to a European, is the way in which the figures 1, 2, 3, &c. represent to an Englishman the sounds of *one, two, three;* to a Frenchman, of *un, deux, trois;* to a German, &c. &c. Imagine that all ideas in these languages were expressed in the same manner by common symbols having no dependence on the sounds; and there will be obtained the phenomenon which occurs in the case of the Chinese.

'During the succeeding dynasties of *Han* (B. C. 200—A. D. 220), the first of which is called *Si*, or western, from holding its metropolis in *Shen-si*, while the latter bears the opposite name of *Tung*, or eastern, from its court having been removed to *Honan*, the empire suffered several revolutions. The ambition of the rulers of the different states, as well as of the ministers of the Emperor, gave rise to various wars; and in the last days of *Han*, so little was left of an empire, that the sovereigns of that period are called *Choo*, or Lord, instead of *Hoang-ti*. The Tartars, too, by their fugitive and predatory mode of warfare,

were the cause of much trouble, and forced the Chinese to propitiate them with alliances and tribute. This impolitic system, which commenced so early, was in subsequent ages carried to a still greater height, and terminated, many centuries afterwards, in the overthrow of the empire by the Mongol Tartars.'—*p.* 7.

It appears, therefore, that neither building the wall nor burning the books, finally kept the Tartars out. Perhaps they were not carried far enough. Which might be the reason, too, why the sovereign came to be called *Choo* or Lord, instead of *Hoang-ti.*

'The dynasty of *Han,* however, is a very celebrated period in Chinese history, and learning especially is said to be under great obligations to it. At the present day, the term for a Chinese, in contradistinction to a Tartar, is *Han-jin,* "a Man of Han." *Paper* and *ink,* instead of the awkward and cumbrous method of pricking characters on the bark of trees with a style, are stated to have been invented during this dynasty, shortly previous to the Christian era*: and it is probable that the rapid progress of Buddhism, or the religion of *Fŏ,* which was soon after introduced from India, was in some measure owing to those inventions. The leading tenets of this sect were taught in the Chinese language, while the mere *sounds* of the characters were used, as a system of syllabic spelling, to express the principal epithets or attributes of the Indian god, as well as the more mysterious, or unintelligible portions of his sacred books. These are now chaunted by the priests, or bonzes, without being understood, even by themselves; and may perhaps serve to excite the greater veneration for the object of their worship, on the principle of "omne ignotum pro magnifico." The appellation *o-mee-to,* which, during my travels with Lord Amherst in the interior, I once saw inscribed around every division of a seven-storied pagoda, is supposed by Sir W. Jones to express *amita,* "immeasurable," the Sanscrit epithet of Buddha: and it is probable that a person acquainted with both the languages would recognize abundance of Sanscrit words in the books of the Chinese bonzes †.'—*p.* 7.

Paper and ink, have always been enemies of the orthodox. Why did not *Han* tax them; and offer a bounty on "pricking characters on the bark of trees?" If governments could begin again, or in a new planet have the benefit of the history of the old, how carefully would they guard against the first glimpses of that change which never ends!

---

* 'The art of *printing* is not recorded to have arisen until about A. D. 925, a little before the time of *Sung.*'

† 'The literary world is under great obligations to Professor Bopp of Germany, for proving beyond a doubt that the Sanscrit and the Greek are little more than dialects of the same language. The similarity of a few scattered words might have been regarded as accidental coincidence; but it requires considerable hardihood of disbelief to set aside the resemblance that runs through the whole conjugations of verbs, &c. &c.'

'The *San-kwŏ*, or three nations into which the empire was divided, towards the close of *Han* A. D. 200, were *Wei* in the north, *Woo*, whose capital was at *Nan-king*, and *Shŏ* in the modern *Sze-chuen*. The period of the three nations is a very favourite subject of the historical plays of the Chinese, as well as of a well written and much prized historical romance, which bears the same name, and of which Sir George Staunton possesses a curious Latin translation. The dress of that period, as represented on the stage, and in pictures, forms a singular contrast with the modern garb which has been forced upon the Chinese by their Tartar conquerors. Instead of the long queue or tail, proceeding from a single tuft at the back of the head, and which forms the usual handle for seizing offenders, the ancient Chinese are depicted with fine heads of hair, folded beneath their caps, and with dresses of a fashion differing altogether from the national costume of the present day.'—*p.* 8.

There is singular energy in the idea of obliging every citizen to wear a handle for the government to lay hold of him by. It was enforced not many years ago by the serjeants commanding guards in Ireland; and may possibly be again.

The dynasty *Tang*, which lasted from A. D. 620 to 900, is remarkable for an outbreak of the lords of the bedchamber. For a considerable time, their influence and authority were such, as to enable them to make and unmake emperors at pleasure. As they could not however possess any real or substantial power, it seems necessary to refer so curious a circumstance to the operations of intrigue. The uncontrolled access which their condition gave them to all parts of the palace, and to the company of both sexes, is suggested as having been greatly calculated to facilitate their projects. The awe of state was not long felt by those who were the immediate attendants, and perhaps the companions of the sovereign, in his private haunts; and that barrier being once passed, the approaches of insolence and usurpation advanced with less interruption. At the close of the dynasty, however, their power was finally crushed in a general massacre; and though they are at this day employed at Pekin in great numbers, the more modern history of China has not recorded their interference in the revolutions of the Empire.—Such are the lessons read by Chinese annals to the inhabitants of courts.

'It was about the end of the same dynasty of *Tang*, or very soon after, that the strange custom of cramping the feet of the higher classes of women is recorded to have commenced. As it has always appeared to myself impossible to refer the origin of such shocking mutilation to any notions of physical beauty, however arbitrary, I am inclined to ascribe it to a principle which unquestionably dictates the *long nails* of the literati and higher classes of Chinese men. The idea conveyed by these is *exemption from labour*, and as the small feet make perfect

cripples of the ladies, it is fair to conclude that the idea of gentility which they convey, arises from a similar association. That appearance of helplessness, which the mutilation induces, is much admired by the Chinese, notwithstanding its usual concomitant of extreme unhealthiness; and in their poetry, I have frequently observed the tottering gait of the poor women compared to "the waving of a willow in the breeze."—*p.* 10.

What shifts is poor aristocracy put to, to keep up its distinctions! What pity that the Chinese aristocracy had not been born with tails!

On the population of China, the author of the Memoir is of opinion, that "all our knowledge is, we nothing know." Nevertheless he thinks it may be "assumed with tolerable certainty, that about 150 millions is the *full extent* of the Chinese population; that is, less than one half of the 333 millions stated to Lord Macartney."

Exceedingly *à propos* to the subject, will be some notices of Dr. Morrison's Translation of a Chinese Proclamation. It purports to have been issued on the 28th December 1822, by Ching, the Foo-yuen; the words "Taou Kwang" at the conclusion, being, not the signature of the issuer, but the name of the reigning Emperor, and analogous, it may be presumed, to the *Vivant Rex et Regina* of an English play-bill. The Foo-yuen is manifestly an important person. He appears to have been an Attorney-General, Privy-Councillor and Lord-Lieutenant all in one, for the province of Canton; and the present proclamation seems to have been issued on taking possession of his office. He comes in his carriage; and on alighting from it, commands all "government officers, clerks, country gentlemen, soldiers, and poor people," to yield implicit obedience. Moreover he is of divine appointment; and may be gathered to have received his commission during a state of things not unlike what now exercises the talents of the magistracy in the disturbed districts.

'Ching, the Foo-yuen, has issued a very long proclamation, exhorting the people, under his government, to industry, and to the practice of all the social virtues. He states his object in eight words: it is, he says, to

"Encourage Industry,
Establish Education,
Praise Virtue, and
Repress Vice."

The effect of which "he hopes will be tranquillity amongst the poor, and the prevalence of good manners and customs."—*p.* 44.

Ching seems to have been a parallel to Lord Peter's loaf; and to have contained in him the quintessence of Constitutional

Associations, Vice Societies, and Cheap Repository Tracts. In short he was a man labouring in his vocation, to keep the people quiet; which is a damning argument, that they had good reason to be discontent.

"Ancient rulers (says the Foo-yuen), thought that, if one man was unreclaimed, it must be some fault in the Ruler." "I commenced life (adds he) as a *Che-heen* magistrate, and in Canton province I served twenty years. I was removed to Shantung and to Honan; and now I am placed here in the situation of Foo-yuen, bearing also the office of Censor-general, General Adviser of His Imperial Majesty, and a Captain empowered to call forth the army of Canton. Music and women [*says this paragon of magistrates*],—goods and gains,—revelry and avarice,—have no charms for me. My only, constant, unremitted, heedful, anxious desire (which I dare not decline to cherish) is, that I may look on national affairs as if they were my domestic affairs, and the affairs of the poor people as if they were my own personal affairs." [*It is astonishing, what sacrifices are made by worthy men in all countries for the public good. And they always die in the end; of sheer riding about in carriages, and abstinence.*]

'Having had to give thanks to the Wise and Holy One, for appointing me to be the soother of the people, I am well aware that, in all the districts under my government, robberies and thefts prevail, and burn; litigations and imprisonments abound, and multiply. Polite decorum and instruction do not flourish; and the public manners are not substantially good. Without an increased and great effort to correct what is wrong, I shall be unable to console the people [*how like a legitimate!*]; and shall have no hope of rendering a recompense for the favour of my country.'—*p.* 44.

There is a glimpse of virtue in the last. Ching is here a magistrate by "the favour of his country;" and neither by the grace of God, nor the will of the Emperor. But Ching, if there be no fraud in him, is better than he looks. For in another place, he vows that he "will subscribe his salary to assist poor districts to establish public schools;"

'and let the Foo districts subscribe 200 taels, and the Chih-le-Chow districts 150 taels, and the Keen districts 100 taels, and all the local officers according to their ability; and let them take the lead, and induce the country gentlemen to come forward, and manage the concerns, &c.'—*p.* 46.

This would be beautifully romantic; if it was not for the suspicion that Ching and the country gentlemen were doing all this to cover some great *hoax*, whereby they were prohibiting foreign commerce for the improvement of their own canal property, or something else after the manners of the kind.

Ching's exhortations divide themselves into four Topics, and twenty-eight Sections. The first Topic is on "Encouraging the

Means of promising Good." He begins by exhorting to the supply of water. It is well he did not tax it. Next, to plant trees; because they "neither require to be clothed with your garments, nor to eat your rice." The Foo-yuen is manifestly the laird, Jock's father, in a metempsychosis. Thirdly, to breed domestic animals; a thing which most people do when they are able. Fourthly, to encourage charity and compassion; because "nature cannot equalize benefits, and give a complete competence to all." Fifthly, to honour economy; for

'Canton is a luxurious extravagant province; and of all the districts *Kwang-chow* and *Chaou-chow* are the most so. The vice begins with the retired literati, and passes to the country gentlemen; from them to the rich merchants; and down to the common people, and petty writers and lictors. They desire to have gay shining dwellings; their wives and children adorned with gold and jewels; their food and drink from the seas and the mountains [*a hint, apparently, from the Political Register*]; their garments to be silks and crapes; their ancestors' halls must, in violation of their proper sphere, have vermillion beams, and doors and pillars—forgetting that Heaven's curse will come on those who affect an enjoyment which does not belong to their place; whereas, in the affluent, charity to the poor, and rescuing the distressed, bring a blessing on posterity for hundreds of years. Besides, the Emperor, who is supreme, and whose riches embrace all the world, encompassed by the four seas, himself sets you an example, &c.'—*p.* 45.

The second Topic is "Establish Instruction." And first he advises to teach filial piety, and fidelity; because "Nature gives to all, whether scholars, farmers, mechanics, or merchants, a connatural sense of the four virtues, &c." Secondly, "Cultivate talent; and schools are the places to foster talent. I hold public schools to be of the first importance. Why so slow in assisting, where aid is required!" Whereon follows the generous determination, to be a great unpaid. Thirdly, "Respect the aged." Fourthly, "*The gentry are the hope of the poor people:* let them instruct them, and guide them, &c." Fifthly, "Let the rich assist their poor kindred." Sixthly, "Let the poor remember, that poverty or riches are according to the decree of Heaven, and let them be content, &c." Much Toryism. Seventhly &c. merchants and traders are exhorted to deal fairly and honestly, mothers to instruct their children, and, since women do not learn to read, fathers and husbands are exhorted to instruct *them*. The third Topic is an "Address to Magistrates." They are exhorted to "laud and soothe the virtuous distressed, as virgins; &c." To honour one thing, and respect another; and finally, to "give honorary banners to families, that excel in domestic virtues." It is plain the Foo-yuen had conceived the idea of a pea-

santry that should be the pet school-boys of the higher orders. The last Topic is concerning things to be discountenanced; and comprehends gaming, suicide, and vagabond attorneys. Canton is stated to "abound in thefts and robberies," by reason of its "abounding in hills and rivers." High ground and running water, it seems, are stimulants to crime. Finally exhortation is made, to "put down the vicious, who rebel against the higher social relations," and to seize on bandits and sharpers.

'If these, my instructions, be but roughly regarded, tranquillity will prevail amongst the people; if they are nicely regarded, a complete renovation of the public manners will be the result.'

'I desire that all my officers, gentry, and common people will not consider this as vague loose moralizing; nor view this document as a paper issued for form's sake; but in deed and in truth respectfully receive it, and act upon it, and the good effects will long be felt, and my hopes will appear to have been substantial, and well founded.'

'TAOU KWANG.'

'2d Year, 11th Month, 8th Day.
(December 28th, 1822.)'

How like is man in one place, to man every-where; equally prosing, fraudulent, and furacious, when there is anything to be got by preaching to those beneath him!

An article by Dr. Noehden collects all the accounts of the *Banyan* or *Indian Fig-tree*, which are found in the works of the classic authors. It is mentioned by Theophrastus; whose account is worth recording for its simplicity and the absence of the marvellous.

'The nature and property of the Indian Fig, with regard to its 'rooting, are peculiar; for it sends forth roots from the young branches, 'which roots are lengthened, till they come in contact with the ground, 'and strike into it. There is thus formed a continuation of roots, in 'a circle, round the tree, which does not approach the stem, but re-'mains at a distance.'—*Historia Plantarum, lib. I. c.* 12.

It is also mentioned by Pliny, Quintus Curtius, Strabo, Diodorus Siculus, and Arrian. A portion of misapprehension probably attaches to the assertion that the tree extends its shade over "five acres," and so as to shelter "ten thousand men." The fact is that the Banyan tree has the peculiarity of letting fall suckers from the branches to the ground, which bear great resemblance on a magnified scale to the suckers of the strawberry plant. These, where they find a favourable soil, take root and produce new trees; which multiply again by a similar process. After the sucker has taken root, the communication with the original tree, instead of decaying, appears to increase at about the same rate as the new plant; so that there is finally formed

a tangle of trees which have the appearance of issuing from the ground and entering it again, and which, for anything discoverable to the contrary, might extend over fifty acres as easily as five. The description here given, is from view of the celebrated tree near Baroche, the Barugaza of Arrian; and which possibly enough may have endured, under successive decays and reproductions of its parts, from the time of that writer.

The *Pancha Tantra* is a collection of Stories, in Five Sections, to be met with, it is stated, in most parts of India; and a collection less ancient, identical for the greater part, but with occasional variations, exists under the title of the *Hitópadéśa*. It is interesting as containing the germs of a multitude of the stories of other countries; which, as they have manifestly not travelled from those countries to India, have in all probability travelled from India to their modern homes. The first instance of this kind given in the Analytical Account of the collection (by H. H. Wilson, Esq.) is from the Adventures of "*Déva Sarmá*."

'One of the incidents of this story has attracted extraordinary admiration, if we may judge by the endlessly varied copies, and modifications of it, which have appeared in the East, and in the West: the loss of her nose by the confidante, and its supposed recovery by the intriguante, for whom she had been substituted, affording a miraculous proof of the wife's innocence, imposing upon her husband, has been retold in a vast number of ways. It is repeated, with different degrees of modification, in the "Roman and Turkish Tales," in the "Decameron" of Boccacio, the "*Novelle*" of Malespini, the "*Cent Nouvelles*," the "*Cheveux Coupés*," a fabliau by Guerin, in the "*Contes*" of La Fontaine, in the "Women Pleased" of Beaumont and Fletcher, and in the "Guardian" of Massinger. The story itself, as told in the *Hitópadéśa*, has been versified by Hoppner; and, as narrated in the *Anvari Soheili*, it has been rendered into English verse, by Atkinson.'—*p.* 162.

'The next story in the *Pancha Tantra* is omitted in all the works derived from this original. It is, however, a well known story, being the same as *Malak* and *Shirin* in the Persian Tales, and the Labourer and Flying Car in the additional stories from the Arabian Nights. It is also narrated, with some variation, in the *Vŕihat Kathá*. The Muhammedan contrivance of a box, and the personification of Muhammed, are rather clumsy substitutes for the fiction of the original, in which the adventurer, in love with a princess, personates *Vishnu*, and rides on a wooden representation of *Garùda* guided by a pin, and moving by magic, the prototype of the flying steed of Magellan; "the wondrous horse of brass, on which the Tartar king did ride;" and other self-moving machines of celebrity, in oriental and chivalric romance.

'The story of "the *Gópi* and her two lovers," is here peculiar to the *Hitópadéśa*; but it is familiar to European story-telling. It is the

third of the three fabliaux, *De la Mauvaise Femme*, and occurs in *Le Roman des Sept Sages*, and the *Novelle* of Bandello, Boccacio, Sansovino, and other similar collections.'—*Ib.*

The well known fable of the Man and the Bear, appears under the form of a Prince who

'acquires a sovereignty of his own, and leaving to his two friends the direction of affairs, amuses himself in his palace, after his own fashion. He has a pet Monkey, as it is said "Parrots, Pheasants, Pigeons, Monkeys, and their like, are naturally the especial favourites of Kings." This Monkey he sets to watch him, as he sleeps in a pavillion in his garden. A troublesome bee settles on the Prince's face, in spite of the Monkey's pains to drive him off, till the latter, highly incensed, snatches up his master's sword, and, making a blow at the bee, cuts off the Rajah's head.'—*p.* 169.

The counterparts of various other European stories subsequently appear.

'The commencement of this story [of the visit of the Rat and the Crow, to *Mant'hara*, the Tortoise; to whom and the Crow, *Hiranyaka* the Rat related his adventures] is the same in all, but the Arabic version here is singularly close. The *Hitópadéśa* alone inserts the story of the young wife, who took her husband by the hair and embraced him, to favour the retreat of her lover; a story well known in Europe, from its version by Marguerite of Navarre, in her "*Stratagème d'une femme qui fit évader son galant, lorsque son mari, qui étoit borgne, croyoit le surprendre avec elle,*" and she borrowed it from the first story of the *Mauvaise Femme*. It was made a similar use of by the Sieur D'Orville, Malespini, Bandello, and other *racconteurs*.'—*p.* 172.

'The addition of the Antelope to the friendly society, occurs here, in the same manner, in all. The story of "The Elephant, liberated from his bonds by the Rat," of which we have a familiar version in the apologue of the Rat and the Lion, next occurs in the *Pancha Tantra*.'—*Ib.*

The Third Section of the *Pancha Tantra* is on the subject of "Inveterate Enmity, or War between Crows and Owls;" but in the *Hitópadéśa* the belligerent powers are the peacocks and the geese. The introductory matter of this section, descriptive of the quarrel between the Crows and Owls and the consultations of the monarch of the former with his five ministers, contains, among other curiosities, the following enumeration of the officers of state "who are, or are not, to be relied upon with confidence." In the opinion of the author of the *Pancha Tantra*,

'The Officers to be distrusted are eighteen.

The minister.	Master of the horse.
The royal chaplain, or priest.	Master of the elephants.

The general.
The young prince, associated in the empire, and designated as successor.
Warden, or chamberlain.
The superintendant of the inner apartments.
Master of the ceremonies.
Master of requests.
Superintendant of the treasury.
Ditto of the stores.
The governor of the fort.
The ruler of the prisons.
The superintendant of the boundaries, or lord of the marches.
A companion.
A courtier.
The foresters.'

'The fifteen naturally attached to the monarch's cause, are

The queen-mother.
The queen.
The confidential attendant.
The chaplet-weaver, or florist.
The bed-maker.
The superintendant of the beds.
The astrologer, or time-keeper.'
Physician.
The cup or water bearer.
The betel-bearer.
The preceptor.
The captain of the body guard.
Quarter-master.
The umbrella-bearer.
Female attendant and singer.'
p. 174.

Such was the wisdom of the court of the King of the Crows. The various examples of European fables told under other names, which appear in the sequel, are too numerous for extraction. The story of the dog killed by its master, which is the foundation of the ballad of *Beth Gêlert*, appears with the substitution of a tame ichneumon which destroys a snake.' The fable of the ass who attempts to be musical, produces a recapitulation of musical terms, among which are stated to be identified the major and minor modes. The story of the weaver, will recall that of the three wishes; to which, however, in point and humour, it is vastly inferior. That of *Sóma-Sarmâ* is in substance the same as that of *Alnaschar* in the Arabian Nights. The story comprised in the last, of the *Râkshasa* who got upon the Brahman's shoulders, contains the hint of the old man who proved so troublesome to Sinbad, in his fifth voyage. The inspection of the whole is confirmatory of the opinion, that the cradle of invention, and probably of mankind, was in India. In some extracts from the allegorical stories of the *Bhója-charitra*, contained in the "Comments on an Inscription upon Marble, at Madhucarghar," by Major J. Tod [p. 218], appear other proofs of the origin of the fabular and fairy lore of Europe.

A subsequent memoir is on an awful subject. It is "Some account of a Secret Association in China, entitled the Triad Society;" by the late Dr. Milne. There is a Secret Association in China! It is "for the overthrow of social order"! Who can say, but there may be carbonari in our tea-pots? There

will be no hope from China, whenever Russia shall be revolutionized or beaten. "It existed in the earlier part of the reign of his late Chinese majesty, *Kea King*, but under a different denomination. It was then called the *T'heen te hwuy*, i.e. 'The Cœlesto-terrestrial Society,' or 'The Society that unites Heaven and Earth.'

'It spread itself rapidly through the provinces, had nearly upset the government, and its machinations were not entirely defeated till about the eighth year of the said Emperor's reign, when the chiefs were seized and put to death; and it was (in the usual bombast of Chinese reports) officially stated to his majesty, "that there was not so much as one member of that rebellious fraternity left under the wide extent of the heavens." The fact, however, was just the contrary, for they still existed, and operated, though more secretly; and it is said, that a few years after, they assumed the name of the "Triad Society," in order to cover their purposes. But the name by which they chiefly distinguish themselves, is *Hung kea*, i. e. the "Flood Family."

'There are other associations formed both in China and in the Chinese colonies that are settled abroad, as the *T'heen how hwuy*, i. e. the "Queen of Heaven's Company, or Society;" called also the *Neang ma hwuy*, or "Her Ladyship's Society;" meaning the "queen of heaven, the mother and nurse of all things." These associations are rather for commercial and idolatrous purposes, than for the overthrow of social order; though it is said, that the members of the "Queen of Heaven's Society," settled in Bengal and other parts, unite in house-breaking, &c.'—*p.* 240.

The object of this society, it is stated, at first does not appear to have been peculiarly hurtful; but, as numbers increased, it "degenerated from mere mutual assistance, to theft, robbery, the overthrow of regular government, and an aim at political power." This, in fact, appears to be the common course, wherever governments allow men to associate at all.

'A Chinese tailor in Malacca, named *Tsaou foo*, who committed murder, in the close of 1818, shortly after the transfer of the colony, and made his escape from the hands of justice, was a chief man in this society; and, it is believed, had a considerable number of persons under his direction, both on the land and at sea. There cannot be a doubt but his escape was partly owing to the assistance of his fellow-members, as a rigorous search was made for him by the police.' —*p.* 241.

'The *professed* design, however, of the *San hŏ hwuy* is benevolence, as the following motto will shew:

Yew fŭh tung heang
Yew ho tung tang.

The blessing, reciprocally share;
The woe, reciprocally bear.

They assist each other, in whatever country, whenever they can make themselves known to each other by the signs.'—*p.* 242.

The government (if it be proper, says the learned author, to dignify the management of so worthless a combination by such an epithet) of the *San hŏ hwuy*, is vested in three persons, who are all denominated *Ko*, "Elder brothers." They distinguish between the ruling brethren, by calling them "Brother first, Brother second, Brother third." The members generally are called *Heung tĕ*, i. e. "Brethren."

All this is very sinful and dangerous; particularly when combined with the fact, that "of the laws, discipline, and interior management of the *San hŏ hwuy*, the writer has not been able to obtain any information."

'There is said to be a MS. book, containing the society's regulations, written on *cloth*, for the sake of preserving the writing long in a legible state. Should a detection be made, the cloth MS. may, for the time, be thrown into a well or pond, from which it can afterwards at convenience be taken out; and in case of the person, in whose care it is, being pursued by the police, and obliged to swim across a river, &c., he carries the MS. with him.'—*p.* 243.

This seems capable of being usefully applied in Europe. Think only of the Secretary of a Corresponding Society swimming a river, &c. and towing after him the regulations of the society written on cloth.

But though the author "has not been able to obtain any information of the laws, discipline, and interior management" of the society, he is competent to authenticate the fact, that

'The heads of this fraternity, as in all other similar associations, have a larger share of all the booty that is procured, than the other members.'—*p.* 243.

Of the initiatory ceremonies also, "but a very imperfect idea can be obtained." Nevertheless

'The initiation takes place commonly at night, in a very retired or secret chamber. There is an idol there, to which offerings are presented, and before which the oath of secresy is taken. The Chinese say there are "thirty-six oaths" taken on the occasion.—A small sum of money is given by the initiated to support the general expense. There is likewise a ceremony which they call *Kwo Keaou*, i. e. "crossing the bridge." This bridge is formed of swords, either laid between two tables (an end resting on each), or else set up on the hilts, and meeting at the point; or held up in the hands of two ranks of members, with the points meeting, in form of an arch. The persons who receive the oath, take it under this bridge; which is called "passing or crossing the bridge." The *yih ko*, or chief ruling brother, sits at the head of this steel bridge (or each with a drawn sword), reads

the articles of the oath, to every one of which an affirmative response is given by the new member, after which he cuts off the head of a cock, which is the usual form of a Chinese oath, intimating "thus let perish all who divulge the secret."—*p.* 243.

'Some of the marks by which the members of the *San hŏ hwuy* make themselves known, to each other, are those that follow:—Mystic numbers; the chief of which is the number *three*. They derive their preference for this probably from the name of their society, "the Triad Society."—*p.* 244.

'*Certain motions of the fingers* constitute a second class of signs; *e. g.* using *three* of the fingers in taking up anything. If a member happens to be in company, and wishes to discover whether there be a brother present, he takes up his *tea-cup* or its *cover* (Chinese tea-cups have always a cover), with the *thumb*, the *fore*, and *middle fingers*, or with the *fore*, *middle*, and *third* fingers, and which, if perceived by an initiated person, is answered by a corresponding sign.'

'They also have recourse to *odes and pieces of poetry*, as secret marks.'—*p.* 245.

Incidental lights thrown on the peculiarities of this fraternity, are that their secret designation of *Hung kea*, literally "*the flood family*," is "intended, perhaps, to intimate the extent and effectiveness of their operations, that, as a flood, they spread and carry everything before them." An apprehension, too, is expressed, that the position of two characters on the society's seal, "both looking towards the straight line on which the words 'Heaven' and 'Earth' are written, may mystically signify the bringing of myriads of nations under the society's influence." But it appears beyond a doubt, that *Chung e foo, wo chŭh tung* on another part of the seal, is "*Let the faithful and righteous unite so as to form a whole* (i. e. a universal empire)."

'This seems the plain sense of the words, according to this arrangement of them; but it is impossible to ascertain whether something else may not be intended, as they are susceptible of as many meanings as arrangements. This version, however, agrees with the general views of this dangerous fraternity.'—*p.* 248.

It is certainly very dangerous, that the faithful and righteous should unite so as to form a whole. The author is further of opinion that "there will appear to be a striking resemblance in some points between the *San hŏ hwuy*, and the *Society of Free Masons;*" though he "would not be understood, by so saying, to trace this resemblance in any of the *dangerous* principles of the *San hŏ hwuy*, for he believes, &c."

'The points of resemblance between the two societies appear to the writer to be the following:—

'1. In their pretensions to great antiquity, the *San hŏ hwuy* profess to carry their origin back to the remotest antiquity. *Tsze yeu chung Kwo*, i. e. "from the first settlement of China;" and their former name, viz. "*Cœlesto-terrestrial Society*," may indicate that the body took its rise from the creation of heaven and earth; and it is known that some Free-masons affirm that their society "had a being ever since symmetry and harmony began," though others are more moderate in their pretensions to antiquity.

'2. *In making benevolence and mutual assistance their professed object, and in affording mutual assistance to each other, in whatever country, when the signs are once given.* Notwithstanding the dangerous nature of the *San hŏ hwuy*, the members swear, at their initiation, to be filial and fraternal and benevolent, which corresponds to the engagement of the Free-masons, to philanthropy and the social virtues.

'3. *In the ceremonies of initiation, e. g.* the oath, and the solemnity of its administration, in the *arch of steel* and *bridge of swords.*

'4. May not the three ruling brethren of the *San hŏ hwuy* be considered as having a resemblance to the three masonic orders of apprentice, fellow-craft, and master?

'5. The signs, particularly "*the motions with the fingers*," in as far as they are known or conjectured, seem to have some resemblance.

'6. Some have affirmed that the grand secret of Free-masonry consists in the words "Liberty and Equality;" and if so, certainly the term *Heung Te*, (*i. e.* "brethren") of the *San hŏ hwuy* may, without the least force, be explained as implying exactly the same ideas.

'Whether there exist any thing in the shape of "Lodges" in the *San hŏ hwuy*, or not, the writer has no means of ascertaining; but he believes the Chinese law is so rigorous against this body, as to admit of none. (To belong to this Society is, in China, a *capital* crime.) Nor does there appear to be a partiality among the members for the *masonic employment.* Building does not appear to be an object with them, at least not in as far as can be discovered.' —*p.* 249.

The inference from all this appears to be, that there are Free Masons in China; and that they are objects of jealousy, as in other countries where men have the misfortune to live under a paternal government. The evidence against them reduces itself to the case of the tailor in Malacca; the proof of whose guilt, and connexion with free masons by land and sea, appears to rest principally on the fact of his having been too nimble for the police. It is difficult to avoid being persuaded that the Chinese free masons have had hard measure dealt to them, and have been unfortunate in having for their historian an individual who had left Europe under the impression of the absurdities prevalent in it before the last expulsion of the Bourbons.

But if there are Free Masons in the East, there are also

Quakers, springing from a George Fox of their own in the province of Delhi. In A. D. 1544 an individual named Bírbhán, inhabitant of *Birjasír*, near *Narnoul*, in the province of *Delhi*, received a communication from UDAYA DAS, teaching him the particulars of the religion now professed by the *Sauds*. A copy of the *Pothí*, or religious book of this sect, written in a kind of verse in the *T'henth* or pure Hindí dialect, has been presented to the Asiatic Society, by W. H. Trant, Esq. M. P., the author of the Memoir.

'The *Sauds* utterly reject and abhor all kinds of idolatry; and the Ganges is considered by them not to be a sacred object; although the converts are made chiefly, if not entirely, from among the Hindus, whom they resemble in outward appearance.'

'The *Sauds* resemble the Quakers, or Society of Friends, in England, in their customs, in a remarkable degree.'

'Ornaments and gay apparel of every kind are strictly prohibited. Their dress is always white. They never make any obeisance or salutation. They will not take an oath; and they are exempted in the courts of justice; their asseveration, like that of the Quakers, being considered equivalent.'

'The *Sauds* profess to abstain from all luxuries; such as tobacco, betel, opium, and wine. They never have exhibitions of dancing. All violence to man or beast is forbiddea; but, in self-defence, resistance is allowable. Industry is strongly enjoined.'

'The *Sauds*, like the Quakers, take great care of their poor and infirm people. To receive assistance *out* of the sect or tribe would be reckoned disgraceful, and render the offender liable to excommunication.'

'All parade of worship is forbidden. Private prayer is commended. Alms should be unostentatious: they are not to be given that they should be seen of men. The due regulation of the tongue is a principal duty.'

'The chief seats of the *Saud* sect are *Delhi*, *Agra*, *Jayapur*, and *Farrukhábád*; but there are several of the sect scattered over other parts of the country. An annual meeting takes place at one or other of the cities above-mentioned, at which the concerns of the sect are settled. In *Farrukhábád*, the number was about three thousand.'

'The magistrate of *Farrukhábád* informed me, that he had found the *Sauds* an orderly and well-conducted people; they are chiefly engaged in trade.'

'Bháwaní Dás [Mr. Trant's principal *Saud* acquaintance] was anxious to become acquainted with the Christian religion, and I gave him some copies of the New Testament in Persian and Hindustání, which he afterwards told me he had read, and shown to his people, and much approved.'—*p.* 252.

When the Free Masons send a mission to the East to look after their Chinese brethren, they should manifestly be accompanied by a Quaker to hold a meeting with friends at Delhi.

Messrs. Burton and Ward, Baptist Missionaries, contribute

a Report of their Journey into the *Batak* Country, in the interior of Sumatra, in the year 1824. Among the peculiarities of the *Batak* race, one is, that they eat their thieves. Adulterers may be eaten alive.

'Persons caught in the act of house-breaking or highway robbery are publicly executed with the knife or matchlock, and then immediately eaten: no money can save them. But if the delinquents are fortunate enough to escape immediate seizure, they are only fined. A man taken in adultery is instantly devoured, and may be lawfully eaten piecemeal without first depriving him of life. Men killed, or prisoners taken, in a *great* war, are also publicly eaten; but, if only two villages be engaged, this is not allowed: the dead are then left on the field to be buried by their respective parties, and the prisoners may be redeemed.'—*p.* 507.

A Letter from Sir Alexander Johnston, lately Chief Justice and President of Council in Ceylon, on the subject of an Arabic Inscription in that island, is exceedingly remarkable for the liberal and friendly spirit evinced by a high public functionary towards the Mohammedan population under his influence, and the testimony borne to their general character and deportment.

'The Mohammedan population on that island [Ceylon] now consists of about seventy thousand persons, who are distributed in every part of the country. The Mohammedan traders still have establishments at Putlam, Colombo, Barbareen, and Point de Galle, from whence they carry on an export and import trade with the coasts of Malabar and Coromandel.'

'Their laws of marriage and inheritance are a modification of the laws of marriage and inheritance which prevailed amongst the Arabs, who were subject to the Caliph of Bagdad at the time their ancestors emigrated from Arabia. Their maritime and commercial laws bear a strong resemblance both to those maritime and commercial laws which prevail amongst the Hindu maritime traders of India, and to those which prevail amongst the Malay maritime traders of Malacca and the eastern islands.'

'The conduct which they, as a body, invariably observed with respect to the different measures which I adopted while I was Chief Justice and President of His Majesty's Council on Ceylon, gave me a very favourable opinion of their intellectual and moral character. In 1806, when I called upon their chiefs and their priests to assist me in compiling for their use, as I had done for that of each of the other classes of inhabitants in Ceylon, a separate code of laws, founded upon their respective usages and customs, I derived the most extensive and valuable information from their local experience. In 1807, when I consulted them as to the best mode of improving the education of their countrymen, I found them not only anxious to co-operate with me on the occasion, but willing to make, at their own

expense, the most liberal establishments in every part of the island, for instructing all the children of the Mohammedan religion in such branches of science and knowledge as I might think applicable to the peculiar state of society which prevailed amongst them. In 1811, when I publicly assembled them to explain the nature of the privilege of sitting upon juries, and of the other privileges which I had obtained and secured for them under the great seal of England, by his Majesty's charter of 1810, I received from them the most useful suggestions, both as to the manner of rendering the jury system popular amongst their sect, and that of attaining the real ends of justice, without militating against any of the feelings, or even the prejudices, of the people. In 1815, when on my proposal they adopted the same resolution which all the other castes on Ceylon had adopted, of declaring free all children born of their slaves after the 12th of August 1816,* I had every reason to applaud the humanity and liberality of the sentiments and views, which they not only expressed but acted upon, in the progress of that important measure.'—*p.* 540.

Not a word of objection, it appears, from a decent Mussulman or Buddhist, to so reasonable a proposal as assigning a term for the cessation of slavery by birth. It is only by a few *âmes damnées* among Christians, that it continues to be resisted. This is one of the points where a prodigious outcry would have been raised if it had suited anybody's interests, on the imminent danger of interfering with native prejudices; an outcry of the same foundation, as was maintained upon the danger of attempting a free trade with the inhabitants of China, till the evidence of facts could be presented to the public*; and of a piece with the perils of not burning widows, the impossibility of effecting any change in the opinions and customs of natives of the East, and other effusions of what the author of "Maxwell" would call the *Twankay-twaddle* spirit, which hold good in England till the evidence of intelligent persons can be brought to bear upon their merits.

The Arabs have introduced into Ceylon the work of Avicenna on medicine, and Arabic translations of Aristotle, Plato, Euclid, Galen, and Ptolemy; extracts of which were frequently brought to Sir A. Johnston at Ceylon by the Mohammedan priests and merchants.

'While investigating questions relative to the laws of marriage and inheritance between the Mohammedans of Ceylon, I have frequently been referred by them for my guidance to notes which they possessed, of decisions given in similar cases by the cadies of Bagdad and *Cor*

* See the evidence of Capt. Mackie and others, on the perfect facility of free trade with China; in the Edinburgh Review, No. CIV. p. 302.

dovæ, which decisions had been observed as law amongst the Mohammedans of Ceylon for seven or eight hundred years.'—*p.* 547.

'The maritime laws and usages which prevail amongst the Hindu and Mohammedan mariners and traders who frequent Ceylon, of which I made a complete collection while presiding in the Vice Admiralty Court of that island, may be classed under four heads: First, those which prevail amongst the Hindu mariners and traders who carry on trade in small vessels between the coasts of Malabar, Coromandel, and the island of Ceylon; secondly, those which prevail amongst the Mohammedan mariners and traders of Arab descent who carry on trade in small vessels between the coasts of Malabar, Coromandel, and the island of Ceylon; thirdly, those which prevail amongst the Arab mariners and traders who carry on trade in very large vessels between the eastern coasts of Africa, Arabia, the Persian Gulf, and the island of Ceylon; fourthly, those which prevail amongst the Malay mariners and traders who carry on trade between the coast of Malacca, the eastern islands, and Ceylon.'—*p.* 548.

To many readers it may perhaps be news, that they have fellow-citizens of the Mohammedan persuasion, carrying on trade in very large vessels between the eastern coasts of Africa, Arabia, the Persian Gulf, and the island of Ceylon; for though all the individuals alluded to may not come under that description, many of them undoubtedly do. The statesman-like interest taken by the Chief Justice and President of Council of Ceylon in their concerns, designates him as most likely to lend his influence and his talents to any attempt to promote the circulation of knowledge, either from East to West or from West to East. Why should the Asiatic Society confine itself to importing Oriental knowledge into Europe, and not apply at least a modified portion of its efforts to the exportation of something of European staple in return? The invention of lithography has broken down the obstacles which formerly existed to the easy and effectual dispersion of European editions in the Oriental languages. Nothing is now required but to procure a native scribe, and any work may be printed with purity and elegance proportioned to the talent of the copyist. No work would be received with such eagerness by the class of persons who have been specially designated, as a concise treatise on Navigation, containing the rules for keeping a ship's way, and for making the ordinary observations by means of European instruments. A table of latitudes and longitudes should be added; in which the utmost use should be made of native counsels, to ensure the designating of places by the names and forms under which they are recognized in the East. A Mercator's Chart of the World in Arabic, would be no great national exertion; and if England cannot compass

it, it would be worth while for France to do it, if it was only for the sake of reckoning the longitudes from Paris. Whoever has associated with the Mohammedans of the East, knows that these are objects which would be received with intense interest, and make an Oriental immortality for whoever had the good fortune to have their names attached. Among works of literature, one of the most favourable for translation into Arabic would probably be *Rasselas;* and (let no man be shocked at the juxta-position) a modern traveller has given a useful hint, in commemorating the eagerness with which certain Arabs collected to hear his extempore translations of *Robinson Crusoe.* Saint-Pierre's romance delights the Pauls and Virginias of modern Greece; why should not the civilizers of Algiers make a present of it to the houris of the East? It may be doubted whether the houris are at this moment extensively gifted with the complicated art of reading; but there are times and circumstances when things strangely find their way, and if there are not many Pauls in eastern landscapes now, there may be*. And the fair Bedouines too (for there *are* such, walking unveiled upon the very spots where once stood Sarah and Rebecca, and maintaining the ancient claim to be "fair to look upon,") what have *they* done, that there should be none in young France ambitious to carry the tales of his proud country to their ear? Are we not brethren all,—sisters except? Why should not there be common stock, in spite of one reading to the right and another to the left?

A letter of the late Professor Carlyle, communicated by W. Marsden, Esq., is valuable for the contradiction it gives to the idea which from some quarter had unfortunately gone forth, that there are great differences among the dialects of the Arabic, as spoken in different regions of the globe, and that they vary materially from the Arabic of the Koran. It would probably be a fair statement of the fact, to say that the language of the Koran bears everywhere the same relation to the conversational language of the educated classes, that the authorized version of the Old and New Testament does to the same in any European country; that is to say, that it is in all cases perfectly correct, and even to a certain extent a model for precise and forcible diction, though it is at the same time true that it would be formal and antiquated in the mouths of any who should insist on employing it in common conversation. Men do not converse in the language of their religious books, any more than in the language of Acts of Parliament, or of de-

* The beauties of the Isle of France and its inhabitants, are familiar subjects of admiration among the maritime Arabs. The machinery of Saint-Pierre would therefore run no risk of being unintelligible.

monstrations in geometry. But it is a long way from this to the assertion, that these and their conversation approach to being distinct tongues. And in the dialects of the uneducated classes, the difference appears to be less than among the provinces of the same European nation; a circumstance which is possibly accounted for by the constant reference made by all classes to the Koran as a standard both of language and opinion*. There are remarkable differences in the pronunciation of sundry letters. A Persian or Indians peaker of Arabic calls the important personage so well known to the readers of Eastern romance, *câzi;* an Arab of the Persian Gulph calls him *câdhi* (pronouncing the *dh* like the English *th* in *thee*); and an Aleppine, it appears, would call him *câdi*. Some dialects obtain an additional sound by turning one of the two *k*'s of the Arabic language (the ق) into a *g;* while others give to the final ك a sound like that of *ng* at the end of English words†.

*It is impossible to avoid taking the opportunity of protesting against the horrible system for expressing Oriental words in European letters, which has been introduced among the English in India. It probably commenced at a period when it was held a mark of "truly British feeling" to express an oriental language by combinations of letters incomprehensible to any but a native of Great Britain. On what other principle can the hideous English diphthong *oo* have been introduced to express the shortest sound of the Italian *u*? And why are the Arabs, after thirty centuries, to be turned into the *Urubs;* and the old established and well accustomed commercial city of Surat, to become *Soorut*? Why, in short, is the sound which mankind in all ages have agreed to call *a*, to be written by Anglo-Indians *u*? The only explanation appears to be, that it has originated with some well-meaning provincial, who thought he spoke refined English by calling butter "*batter*," and thence concluded that the sound in "*batter*" was expressed by the English *u*. The consequence of the whole system has been, that all things are possible, except reading six words of Anglo-Indian Arabic. The simple European vowels, under their continental, or more accurately, their Italian sounds, with the addition of the circumflex to express the presence of a letter of prolongation, would have been intelligible to Englishmen, and to the whole of Europe besides.

† Both of these are exemplified in the Arabic of Africa; though they are by no means confined to that continent. The writer of this note possesses a quantity of African manuscripts, written in the year 1809 in the vicinity of Sierra Leone, which present many points of interest, as connected with the state of learning in the interior of that country. One of these is a political letter of 39 pages; or more properly three letters upon the same subjects, each containing much matter peculiar to itself, along with some that is common to the others. The writer quotes copiously and with considerable talent from the Koran, in confirmation of his arguments: and concludes with a quotation from the *Kamous* of *Firouzabadi*, and a request for forbearance to his defects on the ground that he "is no scholar [قارئ], and knows nothing of the distinctions between letters [of different classes], and between the Active and the Passive, and the Preterite and the Aorist, and the Verb and the Noun and the Particle;" and in another place he excuses himself because he is "poor in knowledge, and unskilled in the management of Pronouns." The last page is occupied by eight lines germane to the general matter, announced as a "poem;" which are here given in the original, for the chance that some person may point out, what Arab moralist has been conveyed across the Sahara

Many brief particulars are scattered in different articles, which it may be agreeable to collect. As the Chinese were

---

in company with Firouzabadi, or whether this "poem" is to be set down as the produce of negro inspiration. The lines in the original are alternate rhymes.

شعر

ومن لزم الصمت نجا

ومن قال بالخير غنم

ومن ظلم الناس عصي

ومن رحم الناس رحم

ومن طلب الفضل الي

غير ذي الفضل حرم

ومن حفظ العهد وفي

ومن احسن السمع فهم

انتهي

'Poem.'

'Who holds his peace, scapes harm;
'Who speaks for good, makes gain.
'Who injures men, rebels *against heaven*;
'Who is merciful to men, receives mercy.
'Who seeks for increase, other than according to
'The *will of the* Lord of *all* increase, is accursed.
'Who keeps his bond, is clear of blame;
'Who acts generously, has his reputation spread abroad.'

'The End.'

Another manuscript, of eleven pages, was copied at the request of the possessor, as a specimen of the books existing in the country; as is proved by its being written with paper and ink given for the purpose. It is in a different hand from that of the writer of the political letter; and appears to have been copied from a very accurate unpointed manuscript, and points added without sense or meaning by the ignorant

acquainted with printing and gunpowder before Europeans, so they also lay claim to the appearance of the small-pox, but not

---

copyist. It purports to be an extract from *Mohammed bin Soleymân al Jezwalŷ* محمّد بن سليمان الجزولي and consists of Mohammedan divinity, with that mixture of the Aristotelian philosophy which the Arabs derived from the Greeks. Inquiry was made after Mohammed bin Soleymân al Jezwaly from the principal Munshi of the College at Calcutta; and the answer, bearing that "Mohammed bin Soleymân al Jezwalŷ was wise, learned, eloquent, &c." seemed to imply that he was recognized by the learned Munshi, though unfortunately nothing like place or date was attached to the account. The extract begins, after the name of the author and the usual forms,

اعلم ان التّوحيد ينقسم علي اربعة اقسام ذاتيّة ومعنويّة وفعليّة وسلبيّة

"Know that the knowledge of The One God is divided into four divisions; that which relates to his Essence, and that which relates to his Qualities, and the Positive, and the Negative." The Attributes relating to his essence are divided into "existence present, and existence past, and existence future, and self-subsistence, and non-liability to accidents." The attributes relating to his qualities are, knowledge, power, will, life, speech, hearing, sight, the perception of all tastes, and the perception of all touches. These are declared to be inherent in the essence of the Deity. The negative attributes are, that there is none like to him, equal to him, &c. The positive, that he is the Merciful, the Creator, &c. There follow some rather curious speculations, carried on by the intervention of a supposed objector, as to whether *far* and *near* can be predicated of the Deity, and whether sensation, reality, and other attributes, are not *accidents*. These end in establishing that "sensation is not accident, for its existence has no reference to periods of time; and that is one of the properties of *accident*; inasmuch as accident is constituted by nothing but that very property." Follows also a discussion upon fluids and solids, body and substance, absolute and relative, dependent and independent, and more out of the storehouses of the logicians of antiquity. Lastly, with the appearance of being a separate extract, comes a controversy on the nature of the evidence for the existence and attributes of the Deity as before described. There may not be much interest in all this; except as it was perhaps not generally understood that these subjects engaged the attention of negro literati in the interior of Africa. What a horror, that such people and their descendants should be kept in slavery by West-India proprietors, who do not know an *Alif* from a *Waul*

Besides these, are other documents of minor import. The first inference from the whole is, that literature in the interior of Africa is not in so low a condition as was surmised. It is plain that an individual able to read and write Arabic, might open a communication with Tombuctoo as effectually as with Delhi; and that translations of any desired works might be introduced with all the effect which the nature of their contents should command. The whole of the manuscripts are written with precisely those peculiarities of letters and of syntax, which are described by the accurate and observant De Sacy in his grammar; proving that one dialect (if the term may be admitted) of written Arabic pervades the African continent from Morocco to Sierra Leone.

A remarkable circumstance is, that wherever the Europeans or white men are mentioned, they are called by the term يهودي *Yehûdy*, "Jews." An African chief writing to the governor of Sierra Leone says, "I never saw the like of you among the *Yehûdy*; for I understand you have got some camels;" animals never seen before in that part of Africa, and which had been brought by sea from Senegal. This throws light on the fact, that in the large maps of Africa, is written in one part of the internal waste, "Here is reported to exist

"sooner than the year 1122 before Christ" (Vol. ii. p. 53.) The earliest mention of this disease in Europe, is in A. D. 710, when it is stated to have been introduced by a Saracen invasion, as the cholera is likely to be by the movements of the

---

a people of Jews;" and a little to the East or West, "Here is reported to exist a people of white men." The two reports therefore resolve themselves into one; and double the evidence for the existence of some race distinguished for their light complexions, in these latitudes.

In these manuscripts the ڭ is used to express the sound of the English final *ng*. The word King in "King George," is كنگ A well known place in the neighbourhood of Sierra Leone, *Rokkong*, is رقنگ And in one of the manuscripts, if there is no mistake, mention is made of the بلدان كنگ which may be surmised to be "the country of *Kong*." De Sacy, in his copy of a Moorish treaty appended to the travels of Durand, exhibits the ڤ as employed in a similar manner, to express the French sound of *main* (a quire of paper) as rendered by the Arabic مڤن

The writer of this once saw at Sierra Leone an individual with straight black hair like an East-Indian, and a complexion lighter than a mulatto, one of two envoys from the King of Temboo; who stated himself to have been engaged in trading between Tombuctoo and Suez. On being asked what he brought from Suez, he replied (through an interpreter) that he brought "coral, and beads, and scarlet cloth, and *fine cloth that was two slaves a fathom*;" the last, probably, some Indian manufacture brought to Suez. On allowing due discount for the expense of bringing a slave to the coast, there is no difficulty in finding Indian products which must sell for the price of a slave per yard in the interior of Africa. This individual stated the name of his country or tribe to be "*Zapât*;" of which no explanation was obtained till sixteen years afterwards, when a French traveller M. Duranton who had resided for some years in Kasson, stated in writing that '*en langue Foulah*, "*tiapato*" *signifie Maure. Saparbé a la même signification.*' 'In the Foulah language, *tiapato* means Moor. *Saparbé* also means the same.' It appears therefore that the traveller of Suez was a Moor; the only one known to have visited Sierra Leone. The writer has to regret that his ignorance at that time of Arabic, deprived him of the probable opportunity of obtaining much interesting information.

Many are the oral reports obtained from the natives of Africa which might be verified by any person in possession of the art and mystery of writing a letter in Arabic. One of these assertions was, that the Senegal and Jolaba (Park's Niger) communicate; which only requires a stream from the mountains to divide into two, and each to be afterwards joined by new streams from the like sources. A stranger report, received from a native of Sego, was of the existence of a nation in the interior, where "the king was a woman, and beat everybody in war." When a child was born, if it was a male, it was employed in domestic offices, but if a female, it was taught "to fight and read the book." The informant mentioned the name of this warlike queen; and though he did not profess to have seen her, he appeared to have the same quiet conviction of her reality, that a European might have had of that of Bonaparte. What is remarkable, is, that the informant represented her as distinguished by the same peculiarity which gave rise to the name of Amazons; but whether through artificial means, or as a natural distinction, was not ascertained. When asked how her dominions lay from his own country, the recollection is, that he pointed to the South East. These circumstances would hardly have been worth recounting, if they had not been confirmed by the French traveller formerly named, who recognized the existence of the Amazonian potentate, and gave her name in writing, *Coumba Killi;* to which appears attached, as written from his dicta-

Russians. There appears to be some evidence that vaccination was practised in remote times in India, and that it is known, distinctly from any European source, on the banks of the Euphrates (pp. 66, 68.)—When corn rises to an unusual height in one province in China, the viceroy "recommends a temporary relaxation of the restrictions on the coasting trade." "When

---

tion, *reine Amazone, un pays de Bambarra auprès de Masina.* The name mentioned by the native Bambarran is believed from recollection to have been *Coumba.*

Has it been generally noticed, that the name of Parker's Niger, جلباء *Jolabâ*, means "Slaves;" and consequently *Nil Abeed* (which appears on some of the maps as the name of a large river further East) and *Nil Jolabâ* mean only the same thing, "The River of Slaves"? *Abeed* means simply slaves, or servants; while *Jolabâ* means slaves as a matter of traffic, being from the significant root جلب *jalaba* "to drag," whence also *Jâlib* a slave-drover, or what Park writes *Jelab.* Park gave some sad instances of the misfortune of not knowing Arabic in Africa. For example, he was shown the "Gospel of Jesus," انجيل عيسي *Injilu Isâ*, and came back saying he had seen a Gospel of Isaiah.

The construction of the English colonial system is irremediably hostile to every prospect of general utility. But it is hoped that the Americans, in the prosecution of their object of removing their coloured population, will at some time establish a twenty-eighth State in the interior of Africa. The point to be aimed at, should be the possession of the elevated region from which flow the great rivers of Africa, the Senegal, the Jolaba, the Gambia, and the Rio Grande; which is in the direction of Park's Kamalia. In mountain war the possession of the sources of waters is the key to success; because along the waters lie the roads, and he who has the heads of the streams has the passages in all directions; and a similar effect would result in a peaceful way in Africa. Since the success of Columbus, there has been nothing left for individual enterprise to achieve, at all comparable to the glory of conducting a population of black *squatters* to the Niger. Such an undertaking wants nothing but (as Napoleon was fond of expressing it) "a man;" and whenever "a man" shall be born of the mixed blood in the Southern states of North America, the thing may be effected.

The writer of this never heard Tombuctoo called by Africans by any other name than "Tambacouta;" and on asking the officers of an Arab frigate if they could suggest any meaning for "Tambacouta," they replied that in Hindustáni it meant "Copper Fort." Is there any community between the languages of Africa which are not Arabic, and the Hindustáni; as, for instance, are there Sanscrit words in Africa? There is certainly a resemblance between the names of villages in India and in Africa. For example, every traveller in India must have stopped at many a *Sankary;* and *Sankary* is the nearest town to the source of the Niger. A native of the place, once described the river there, as about eighty yards across, and "full of great stones and crocodiles;" apparently a kind of African trout-stream. The name of the Orang Outan in Africa is *Rang Otou;* which is believed to mean "wild man." Does not Orang Outan mean the same in Malay? In confirmation of the name's signifying "wild man," the Africans maintain that there are two races, a black and a white, which they consider as a harmony with what takes place in the human species; and it is true, as stated by some of the old voyagers, that there is a popular opinion, that the Orang Outans are men, who refuse to speak lest they should be made to work. The grown female of the African Orang Outan is exactly four feet high. A skeleton of one was sent to England in 1809, believed to be for the late J. Pearson, Esq. Surgeon to the Lock Hospital; and is possibly in the possession of his successors. The male is understood to be considerably taller; but an adult specimen of the male was never seen by the writer.

the price of grain in *Fŭh-këen* shall have sunk to its usual level, let the customary restrictions be resumed" (p. 88). —The celebrated *Nana Farnevis*, who died in 1800, cared neither for Rama, Lacshman, Hanuman, nor Crishna, and believed in THE ONLY ONE—THE SPIRIT (p. 106).—The Indian *chatara*, from *cha* "six" and *tar* "string or wire," is the original of the Greek *kithara* and the modern *guitar* (p. 305).—One of the names of the Indian Apollo, *Carana*, is stated as being visible in the Greek and Celtic title of *Carneios*, and in the name of *Carnac* in Brittany, where traces of his worship are found (p. 314). Is it not equally apparent in the name of the temple of *Karnak* in Egypt?—The "thunder-stone" or aerolite, but recently known to the European philosopher, is mentioned by an Indian poet who was the contemporary of David and Solomon (p. 308).—Crishna, the Indian Apollo, is said to have stopped in battle, to take a bell from the neck of an elephant, and place it over the egg of a lapwing that rose before him from its nest (p. 289).

The Article on the Poetry of the Chinese, by J. F. Davis, Esq., contains many favourable specimens, evincing both taste and imagination. The "inlet of peach blossoms" is a romance on a China basin. A person fishing in a boat, upon a lake, is supposed to have been led, by the track of peach blossoms floating on the water, into a narrow creek, which he pursued till he reached a place inhabited by beings who had escaped from the persecution of the tyrant, the maker of the wall and the "Six Acts," and had lived without subsequent communication with the world. On his return from this Chinese paradise, the boatman related what he had seen; but on attempting to find the place again, it had vanished. An allusion is made in one place to the burning of the books;

> '——— the lays
> Their children sang had 'scap'd the general blaze.'
> Vol. ii. p. 430.

The Chinese prosody has its Tetrameters, Pentameters, and Heptameters. The following specimen of the Pentameters has merit as a piece of quiet description.

Kew kih tsoo kwei le,
Chuy suy taou Koo-yoong;
Leaou tsin hing lŏ king,
Tseay kee keuen yew tsoong,
Seng tuy koong jaou shĕ;
Shan kwon puh kae yoong.
Lew lëen wong jĕ moo,
Hwuy show wan t'hang choong.

'When my ancient guest first returns to our neighbourhood,
I accompany him to the monastery Koo-yoong;
We stroll along together, in search of pleasant walks,
And then rest our weary footsteps within.
The priests sit opposite, indulging their tongues in leisure talk;
—We look at the distant hills, and remark the unchanging features of nature.
Carried on by the stream of converse, we forget the day is closing,
But at last, turning our heads homewards, we listen to the vesper bell.'
p. 402.

Under the descriptive class is introduced a poem on London, composed by a Chinese who visited England about the year 1813. With characteristic propriety, he notes among the peculiarities of the English, that

'With strong tea they immingle rich cream,
And their baked wheaten bread is involved in unctuous lard.'

Of a similar description with the stanzas on London is another poem, not concerning the English exclusively, but Europeans in general; composed by a Hong merchant who has been dead some years. (*See vol. ii. p.* 449.)

'This person, notwithstanding his unpoetical profession, was possessed of very respectable literary acquirements, and one of his sons held a high rank in the imperial college at Peking. "After an intercourse of thirty years (to use his own expressions), which had made him tolerably familiar with the peculiarities of foreigners, he had retired, stricken in years, into solitude, and amused himself over his cups in composing a score of stanzas commemorative of some strange customs and opinions prevailing beyond the seas." The production corresponds with its title, *Seyang tsăh-yoong*, "Unconnected Stanzas on Europeans;" and, after the perusal of the foregoing description from a person who had viewed us at home, may be deemed curious, as depicting the estimate formed of us by one who had never left his own country. With that want of minute discrimination which might be expected under such circumstances, the verses treat chiefly of those leading features which are common to all nations wearing hats and coats, and mingle, together with the rest, the Roman Catholic ceremonies of the Portuguese at Macao.'

'The retired bard commences with lauding the good faith of the foreigners, who "make use of no formality, in their most extensive bargains, more solemn than a mere shake of the hand," and proceeds to hint, in the next verse, that "the simple virtues of barbarians have been the subject of praise from the oldest times." It is quite true that commercial transactions of the largest description are frequently conducted at Canton on the mere faith of promises; and the good poet had never been in the way of seeing our legal stamps and parchments at home, which might have gone far to make him withdraw his last compliment.'

'When a guest arrives, the host helps him with his own hand to

"the juice of the grape,"—and it is added in a note, "they welcome visitors with wine, and not with tea," which is the Chinese fashion. "To touch glasses in drinking is a mark of friendship. In winter evenings they sit by the fire and pour out *cold* wine, careless of the snows which lie deep beyond the door." In China they always warm their wine.'

"They make light of their lives," it is observed, "on occasions of personal contest, and when two of them quarrel, the consequences may be very serious. They stand face to face, and discharge fire-arms at each other on a given signal." In a note it is said, "If one fall, the survivor is not punished: if neither fall, there is an end of the quarrel." "They do this," adds the poet, "to shew that they are not afraid,—and so forth."

"Our author marvels much at the comparatively late period at which Europeans marry, but endeavours to explain it in this way. "Their distant voyages abroad keep them long from home, and it is not until they have accumulated a fortune that they return to take a wife. Many do not marry before fifty years of age; and if the bride be very young on these occasions, it is no scandal." The knowledge of the worthy Hong merchant on this subject seems to have been much on a par with that of the St. Helena lady, who asked if London were not thrown into a great bustle by the arrival of the India fleet.'

"In the regulation of the annual period, they have no intercalary moon, but the new year always commences ten days after the winter solstice. On this occasion they powder their heads with white dust, and all get tipsy." This evidently refers to good old times, and to manners now gone by. The author himself adds in a note: "This habit has of late years worn out." There is a variety of other detached observations, less worthy of notice, and the poem concludes with mentioning, that "the foreigners had been fighting together for some twenty years; but it was to be hoped they would soon make peace with one another, and all have an opportunity of improving themselves by an intercourse with China."

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 April, 1831.

ART. XI.—*Quarterly Review, No. LXXXVIII; Article on 'Parliamentary Reform.'*

WHEN voyagers are engaged in some important enterprise, like that of Captains Ross and Parry and their crews, two things are permanently interesting to themselves and friends,—their musings during the attempt, and their reflexions afterwards. The following remarks were commenced on the day when, after four months delay in port, the commanders of the Whig bomb and Russell pink loosed topsails for our first stretch into the narrows of Reform. So heaven speed the good ships, and send us all safe to add the ending.

Concerning the causes and motives of this final movement, scarcely any man present doubts,—though there are a few that

maintain an argument upon the subject,—that it arose from the impossibility of staying where we were. Some who had got Esquimaux wives, and had otherwise made themselves comfortable with whale's fat and bear's meat, insisted that our moving was wholly needless, and that it was better to stay here year after year, than to take advantage of the season to weather a point upon our passage, But most of the crew were of a contrary feeling; being of opinion that the stores of these individuals had been collected by frauds on the remainder, and that their fat and comfort would do nothing for the rest. So that there was great cheering among the hands, when they were really turned up to make a start; though some think that after all, the other party will in some way contrive to run us back to Blubber Bay, and have another year's enjoyment with their squaws. But whether they do or not, a move is a move; and if we are blown back tomorrow, we shall at all events have got over the old wives' notion, that there was some necessity for staying here for ever.

This is a fair enough representation of the state of things. And now to employ the time, in making an overhaul of the arguments of the "stationary party," as opposed to the party of the movement, who got very little of the whale's tail and are sick of what they had, and who mean and design, vow and promise, and swear by all gods naval and terrestrial, to stand by these or any other commanders, who will push forward boldly and honestly, and give us a chance, if it be ten years hence, of reaching some place of christian comfort, and getting rid of the soup and *pemmican* diet we have so long been doomed to.

And first among the party for sitting still, as in duty bound, appears the Quarterly Review. It made a woeful failure, in advising the retrograde movement of the Bourbons; and now attempts to mend it, by an Article born out of due course of nature, directed against the progress of reform at home. And first it is in a state of most innocent wonderment, as to the cause and origin of the "sudden chaos of unanimity" displayed in demanding Parliamentary Reform. It is strange that it never occurred to the benevolent inquirer, that it was because everybody wanted it. But the preferred solution is, that it was the "*dread of physical force.*" There is sometimes more truth in the suggestions of an adversary than at first appears; for it is an easy thing for an adversary to stumble on the opponent's truth, and mistake it for his own. It is perfectly and undeniably true, that

"through certain strainers well refin'd,"

the fear of physical force is what in this as in other cases,

must bring men justice. All justice, politically speaking, is but a compromise of clashing wills, in that which will obtain the greatest number of voluntary adherents, as the rule which shall be applicable to themselves. Thieves go to the wall, because there are more men interested in honesty than thieving; and the thing they virtually fear, is not that the honest men should write books against them, but that they should buy a rope, and build a gallows, and come upon them with a greater force of fists, or staves, or regulation musquets, than the rogues can muster to reply. The judge upon the bench, sits there by virtue of the dread of physical force. The losing defendant or the defeated plaintiff, pockets up his opinion of his wrongs, and submits with what grace he may to the verdict of a jury, because he knows there is a jury of more than twelve behind, whom it would be useless to resist. The old, avowed, constitutional reason, why the Horse Guards never rode down the liberties of the subject, is agreed to be, that in the long run it would be a bad military movement. There is no use in combating the fact, that the submission of the greater physical power, must be with the consent of the greater physical power; that is, that in some form and shape, the strongest must see greater advantages in submitting themselves to the supposed rule, than in attempting to subvert it. Free governments are simply an invention for bringing the clashing interests into unison without violence; for making the government direct what the people will obey, and so the people obey what the government shall direct. This is not Radicalism; it is good Whiggery of 1688. If it is denied, and there is a new light, let it be known and the answer shall be forthcoming.

It is therefore unmeaning and entirely beside the mark, to state that the present occasion differs from any other occasion where justice has been demanded and obtained, in the circumstance that the dread of physical force is virtually at the bottom. It is as true, as that men work for fear of want. But there is a vast difference in the degree of proximity with which this fear may press in different instances. As far as the fear of the holder of *one* hundred thousand a-year who is afraid of wanting *two*, is from that of the beggar whose life depends upon the night's receipt,—so far is the dread of physical force which operates in the instances adduced, from the naked dread of violence with which the adversary would confound it. One is a dread speculative, precautionary, remote; the other is a dread which can only be incurred by those who have been successful in setting precaution at defiance.

But another point advanced is, that events upon the Con-

tinent have given strength to the apprehensions, however remote or near, of physical force. It is true; it is very true. And therefore politicians of any sanity, must make a step also, in conceding to the principle that has thus gained strength. "*Don't reef your topsails; it would be conceding to physical force;*" such is the Tory seamanship. Where the gale came from, heaven that sent it knows. Whether the recommendation of the Quarterly Reviewers, and the demolition of the Bourbons consequent thereon, had any connexion with the burning of Persepolis, or were portion of some great cycle of events of which mankind has not existed long enough to calculate the orbit, are things which will perhaps be known, when we can calculate the winds, and bring the storms under the registration of an almanack. But till that time comes, the pilot must be content to know there is a gale, and stoop to exercise his art in subordination to the facts that meet him. The people were patient once; they are not above half as patient now. Will the thing be mended by refusing to recognize the fact? It is perfectly true, that the British people have been trampled on, in exact proportion as the people were trampled on in other countries. They read it in their statute book and in their newspapers, in their purse and in their store, in their pension list and in their sinecures, and above all in the thousand-and-one inventions for restraining them in all branches of their trade and honest gains for the benefit of a monopolizing few. They submitted to this, among other reasons, because a minister of their free and fortunate country told them the situation of things abroad was such as to leave no hope of successful resistance to oppression at home. The possibility of actual resistance fell below zero by the successes of the Cossack arms, and the possibility of virtual opposition to injury fell with it by the same quantity. It is therefore no object of wonder to sane men, that with the removal of the pressure, the pitch of men's hopes should rise. The allies of the English absolutists have been utterly routed at Paris, beaten again at Brussells, defied in Italy, held at bay in Poland;—on what one principle do they maintain that they ought to be feared as heretofore? Nobody submitted to their oppressions, but through dread of physical force;—did they ever imagine there was any more delicate bond between themselves and the community? When men and women were massacred at Manchester, for doing what in these amended times is not only permitted but a virtue, did they dream it was love for the sabrers, that produced an after compliance with their mandates? It is not politic that they should harp much on the subject of physical force; lest they wake recollections

which are best kept down, when an odious enemy is on the point of being at the mercy of the wronged.

The great failing of the absolutists,—the point on which the fallacy of their judgment is viewed with the most commiseration by their opponents,—is in believing that the nation under their system had attained to "a high degree of prosperity," or that anybody besides themselves can be found to think so. The true state of the case, and that which makes the desperation of their cause, is that everybody except themselves has an intimate and saving faith that their system, instead of tending to the prosperity of the country, was all compact of plans and devices for ensuring its unhappiness. To borrow Paley's metaphor, the persuasion of the public is, that what they dwell upon as the essential and inseparable component of a wholesome constitution, was in reality one great gland for the formation of gout and misery,—a complicated organization of which evil was the beginning, the middle, and the end, and in which not the least sensible part of the mischief was, that a necessity was to be imposed upon us all, of cheering it as if we really believed it to be wholesomeness. Their "settled order of the constitution" meant nothing but the settled order of monstrous imposthumated ills, which everybody would have got rid of if they could, and will get rid of when they can. Of course those who profited by the ills, were an exception to the opinion; but there was nobody else. All men were inwardly banded together against what was obtruded upon them as good; and waited only for time and opportunity to throw it off like a vermin-haunted garment, which necessity for a while might have compelled them to endure. The last French revolution was mainly undertaken and carried through, from dread and horror of having something like the constitution of the English borough-holders imposed upon that country; and this consummation was not a little promoted, by those who in England held out their supplicating hands to the French people, and begged them like the sinner in the Gospel, of all things not to "come into this place." That what the borough-holders contend for, is dear and venerable to themselves, is what they are at perfect liberty to tell each other; but to everybody else, it is the object of unmeasured hate and scorn,—the chain, the load, the nuisance, which men think of on waking in the morning, and pass the day in devising how they shall abate.

In fact the Tories never had any idea how hateful their system was to all the really powerful portions of the community. They maintained a sort of *in-and-in* communication with each other, and spirited one another up to believe that all who were

their adversaries were base and to be despised. Words sank under them in their efforts to display their measureless contempt for everything that was opposed to them; and now the public from all quarters, with the beadles and constituted authorities in full uniform at their head, are running in upon them as at the last hour of a parish sheep-biter. This is what the thing has come to. And much they appear to marvel at the parish unanimity; as not discerning, that though all men may not be agreed upon what is to be done henceforth for evermore, there is a most perilous accordance upon one preliminary, which is that *their* power shall be made an end of. They ask with infantine simplicity, whether parliament is less competent to perform its functions now, than it was a year ago. The answer of the English people, with the majestic vision of the Attorney General at its head, is that as far as *they* have been able to effect it, parliament has always performed its functions ill. The mischief is not of the growth of yesterday; the people of England, or some of them, can read history and keep an account; and if they wish for abridged versions, the Index to the Statute Book during the times of Tory domination since 1792 may supply the one, and the amount of debt the other. That the nation has "attained a high degree of prosperity" under the system which it is intended to remove, is what the nation does not believe. On the contrary its firm faith,—the faith of all who have not an interest in the abuse transcending their portion of the suffering,—is that the nation has been wronged and shortened of its just prosperity, to an extent unparalleled in the range of history. It would be no excuse for a banker's clerk to say to his principal, "Sir, you have attained to a high degree of prosperity, under the system I have pursued of robbing you every night I could." The question is not of what was left, but what was taken. The matter in debate is, whether the Tories did not pursue an organized system of injustice; whether in their several provinces, and according to the different capacities that heaven might have given them, they did not set up a wheel within a wheel, and frame all manner of machines, from a hand-bucket to a high-pressure steam-engine, to pump up the moisture of the state and pour it into their peculiar tubs and individual reservoirs;—whether they did not keep open shop, for the delivery of a portion of the public spoil to everybody who would give valuable assistance in return, and whether they did not make the country one nest of jobbers, where the labour and the patrimonies of the operative and middle classes were turned over by a constant and uniform operation, into the possession of the parties engaging in the plot. And yet they profess to doubt

whether their opponents produce any "strong *primâ facie* case of practical expediency." *This* is the expediency; that men should keep their own. The defendants lie under a grievous practical mistake; it is *we* that are the "conservative," and *they* that make the revolution in men's goods and chattels. It is *they* who have arranged and perfected a machinery, by which no man can call anything his own, except during the brief period the wheel takes in turning round. The whole "conservative" is at this moment in full march upon them; and the men babble about keeping up their right of wrong. They swear that they will stand upon their property, and not give up their pick-lock keys;—they will die in the last ditch, in defence of their *jemmies* "and all that is dear to them." The whole thing which they defend, is something which everybody but themselves considers as an outrage upon society,—as one of those flagrant wrongs which it is the object of the formation of society to put down. It may be that the accused deny this; or even that they affirm with the weight of their individual influence and responsibility, that they have been the authors of all good, —that in them and their benevolent exertions the community has lived and had its being. But what effect can this have on the question of their permanence, if everybody else is of the contrary opinion? Every defendant thinks well of himself; but the ticklish point is what opinion may be formed of him by those by whom he must stand or fall. But, say the defendants, we have a power; we can vote; and because we are in the legislature, by our votes the country must abide. To which one answer is, that this could not go on for ever. The string would crack; though it may not be determinable precisely when. All such strings have cracked, since the foundation of the world; there is no instance upon record, where a party has become odious to the community at large, that sooner or later this has not taken place. But there is a nearer road than this; you will *not* vote; you will desert before the matter comes to anything like this mark, or at least so many of you as will decide the question. The waiters upon Providence will all receive a timely hint to go over; and if it does not reach them this month, it will in some other. There is no danger or possibility, of a party deserted by the community, permanently holding together in the manner supposed. The dry-rot will be in its timbers, and one after another will moulder and give way; and though there may be some pieces of tough tory mahogany that nothing can change or alter, they will only be reserved for the glory of going down together in the gulph of a minority. It is a provision of nature, that in a government where the community at large possesses

a certain portion of influence, a party which has incurred a certain quantity of odium shall go down quietly, without danger of necessitating a popular convulsion to secure its fate.

Much has been spoken of "anomalies," and the folly of altering a practice of ancient standing for the sake "of symmetry and system." The answer is, that the alterations are not made for the sake of symmetry and system, but because the system as it stands, tends directly to produce evil. "It is desirable that a ship should be water-tight; would you therefore for the sake of system, stop a hole in the bottom? A rope leads the wrong way, and draws forward what ought to be drawn aft; would any man in his senses think of correcting such an anomaly? Remember how pleasantly you have sailed with four feet water in the hold; and reflect upon the weakness of human judgment, and the probability there is that the leak was what was keeping you afloat. Attempt no violent innovations. We are to look to the end and not to the instrument; and how do you know, that if the leak were to be stopped, you might not go down like a shot? Depend on it, the leak is nothing but an anomaly. As you value the lessons of experience, keep up your anomalies." Such are the recommendations of the old school of pilots. It remains to be seen how far the modern crew will give into the reasoning.

When an argument is brought forward on a public question and proves to be a fallacy, the respondent is not answerable for any degree of undesirableness which may exist about the agitation of the question. He answers, because the answer is demanded; he replies, because the community at large is virtually challenged for a reply. In the present case there appears to be a fallacy in the defence offered to the attacks stated to have been made on the pensions on the civil list.

'These pensions, limited by the bill submitted to parliament in November last to the annual sum of 139,000*l.* for the present reign, form one of the charges on that fund which is granted to the crown for the maintenance of its splendour and dignity, *in exchange for its hereditary revenue*. It may, or it may not be, fit that this portion of the fund should be placed at the sovereign's disposal. The sum may be too large, or it may be too small: but, having once been appropriated, the fund ceases to be under the control of parliament; it stands, thenceforth, on the footing of private property; the pensions charged on it are merely so many emanations of the royal bounty; and, however expedient it may be, that their general amount should be reconsidered and regulated whenever, by the demise of the crown, the civil list generally comes under review, the manner and details of their distribution can be no just concern of the public; and even though it may be that a sound discretion has not always governed that distribution,

though it may be that pensions have been occasionally bestowed on improper grounds, or even from improper motives, there, surely, is a principle of common decency which ought to protect these benevolences of the crown from a scrutiny, which, to say the least, is not usually applied to the gifts or charities of private individuals.'—*Quarterly Review, No. LXXXVIII. p.* 567.

The foundation of this somewhat lengthy argument, is the same as of one which should propose that the territorial revenues of the archbishopric of Canterbury should be given away in pensions by the receiver, and a new revenue found for the archbishop by the public. If a king, William of Nassau for example, had a revenue derived from crown lands or otherwise, it was because he was king, and in return for being king. The crown lands, like every other source of revenue, were secured to him for the purpose of keeping up his state and dignity, and not of giving away to dowagers, distinct from those objects. If the king thinks the dowagers are his state and dignity, he has an undoubted right so to determine; but no right can thence arise for the Quarterly Reviewers to charge us twice for the state and dignity. The fallacy consists in asserting, that what is called the hereditary revenue of the crown, or may have been given in exchange for it, was not given for any public purpose; and that the crown may dissipate this on objects avowedly not public, and charge the amount again upon the people.

After allowing that "the main cause with us of the increase of the public burdens has always been *war*," it is an evasion to shift the reason to an assertion that "war is a favourite amusement with the people of England." It is true enough, that "there are not wanting those who impute all our past wars to "the boroughmongers;" but it is no kind of answer to this imputation, to say that there are also those who assert "that if the "people were fairly represented in parliament, we should have "wars no more," or even to move the question whether "absti-"nence from wars of aggression or ambition is one of the cha-"racteristics of free states." This is all what in a hare is called doubling. The unanswered truth is, that the public burdens have been increased by wars made by and for those who are styled the boroughmongers. Everybody knows what pains they were obliged to take, to get up and maintain those wars;—how many they hanged, how many beheaded, how many drew the bowels out of, how many they transported, for the one and sole purpose of preventing men from meeting together to oppose such wars, and to communicate the knowledge of the profound folly and injustice of their origin and continuance. If a parliament subject to popular influences had engaged in wars, it would at least have engaged in wars for popular interests and not against them.

It would certainly not have engaged in them for the purpose of keeping up the power of fingering the public purse, and of abandoning it only when it had become difficult to find the means of discovering anything more to take. This power of fingering the public purse, is what is denominated "*protecting the people from themselves*,"—preserving them, to wit, from the ignorant impatience of parting with their money, which they might otherwise give way to.

It requires little observation to be convinced, that this pretext of "protecting the people from themselves," as advanced to prove the necessity of lodging the power of taking money in a certain number of proprietors of rotten boroughs, is on a par with a plan which should propose to preserve travellers from the self-indulgence which some men are apt to give way to in their various halts and resting-places, by establishing a protecting corps of gentlemen of the road, who should ease them of the means of evil. The proof that one party are unable to take care of themselves, and that the other are the proper judges of how far they may be trusted to their own discretion, is as absolutely absent in one case as in the other. Not one of the party to be protected, can be found consenting to the plan. Nothing ever made the necessity visible to any man's optics, except the personal prospect of being one of the party that were to profit by it. Nobody has ever asked the borough-mongers to take care of him; it is a purely volunteer piece of charity, as far as regards everybody but themselves; a simple act of supererogation, deduction made of the gratification which virtuous efforts produce to the performer. Imagine a political teacher standing up and saying, "Whoever will be saved, it is in the first place necessary that he make himself some rotten boroughs." Calculate the probability of demonstrating, to any man in full possession of his natural faculties, that a step towards a proper representation, is to introduce a number of individuals who shall represent nobody but themselves. This is all the holy ground of politics; the sacred precincts of unreason, within which it would be sacrilege for common sense to set its foot.

There have been mail coaches and other means of communication in this country far too long, to allow it to be in any sense politic or prudent for an adversary to declare that "*a war against property is the real principle and the only serious pursuit of radicalism.*" Such an assertion might produce some effect where the proceedings of one part of the community were a mystery to the others; but can never operate where all men act in the face of an inquiring public and an informing press. It is true there are various plants in the garden of ra-

dicalism, from the cedar of Lebanon to the hyssop on the wall; but it is stoutly denied, that any one class ever moved or contemplated a war against property. On the contrary, let but the just occasion come, and they will all rise upon a whistle, in defence of everybody's property and their own. They have property to defend as well as other people; and they mean to do it. The fear is only with those, who are rich by taking other people's property. The Radicals are, and it is well known always have been, intrinsically conservative; it is a mere invention of the enemy, which says they ever wanted to take away any property, except the property in wrong. Even on the debated points most pompously brought forward by the Quarterly Review, some of the most urgent arguments for the side the Review would probably call the right, have proceeded from portions of that body. There may be differences of opinion among the Radicals, and as is almost a necessary consequence, some of them may be wrong. But the charge against the early Christians of cultivating licentiousness and sacrificing children, was not more futile, groundless, and it may be added undangerous, than that advanced against the Radicals of being engaged in a war against property. The mistake is an easy one; it is not a "feud of the house of *Want* against the house of *Have*," but against the house of "*Take*." Radicalism is simply a rising-up of the industrious classes of society, in union with many of the middle ranks and some of the higher, for the protection of property against those who want to take it away by means of rotten boroughs. The complainants say, that they are thin on the ribs by reason of rotten boroughs. They beg that they may be allowed to send a deputation to the House of Commons, and that a Committee may be appointed to feel and report. They say that they die in holes and corners, and have nothing but sorrel in their insides when they are deceased; and they offer to prove before the Honourable House, that their hearts' blood has gone to paint the noses of the boroughmongers. They utterly deny that they are well at all; but that on the contrary, as one also of their own poets has said,

'Hungry bellies, empty purse,
May be better, can't be worse.'

It is an awful state of society when large masses become poetical in this metre. Objections may be raised by the critics; but it is not the poet-laureate that will write such verses down. To these complainants are joined the middle classes; who have at last found out, that though they did not individually die of hunger within the year, they were put into the list of bank-

rupts, which is a thing almost as abhorrent to their nature. The middle classes, powerful by their intelligence as by their numbers, have weighed and sifted the argument, and come to the conclusion that rotten boroughs are an invention, by hook or by crook, to make their money over to the fraternity of borough-holders. All these divisions have fairly committed themselves. There is scarcely an honest or independent man among them, who has not in some way or other been guilty of *Lèse*-Toryism. If they were to fail in their object through any want of energy in themselves, they know they would be decimated. They are fully aware, that they would be subjected to all the horrors of a Restoration. Pious tories would lie awake all night, and have a revelation of a gagging-bill towards morning. The energetic among them have already begun a subscription for the French Guards, who failed in the attempt to put down the press and establish despotism at Paris. There is no difficulty in knowing to what purposes they would apply our own Guards, if they would obey their call*.

The last paragraph of the Quarterly Review is full of dark sentences; yet, unless its meaning has been greatly misunderstood, it bears upon the horrors which might be expected from a return of Tory domination. Was it really intended to state, that anybody holding the situation of a Judge attempted to stipulate, before he would discharge his office, that the hangman should not be disappointed of his fees by the mercy of the crown? Now let us, the *hangees* that are to be, sift and examine this position. We are told habitually that judges are disinterested people; that they perform coldly and impassionately a painful office; that they are to be preserved by all pos-

---

* Upon this subject nothing can be done more effectual than to give literal extracts from the forms of subscripton as published in the newspaper which boasts itself the organ of the opponents of Reform. Nobody can avoid seeing that the *animus* is to impress upon the British soldiery the duty of putting down the liberties of their country if ever they should be told. It is not intended to dispute the right of individuals to subscribe for any purpose they think proper; but it is maintained that others have a right to regulate their own actions in consequence. It is distinctly impressed on every individual to whom this statement may come, that the fact of a subscription having been got up for the unsuccessful troops of the expelled dynasty of France, in such terms and under such feelings as are below presented, makes an additional reason why every man of common foresight should redouble his efforts to preserve himself and family from the personal danger and misery of a failure in the ministerial plan of Reform. The known moderation, and aversion to unnecessary violence, of the conductors of this Review, it is hoped will give increased weight to their present recommendation.

The following extracts are from the Morning Post, during the week beginning with the 8th of March, 1831.

'THE ROYAL GUARDS OF FRANCE.—It is with high gratification we refer our Readers to the First List of Subscriptions (annexed to the Advertisement in a preceeding column, and received in the course of a few days), for the Relief

sible means from any feeling in the results of their decisions, and are to approach as nearly as possible to the imperturbability of a steel-yard; and that we are not to be hanged after all, till the crown has further considered, whether mercy can be extended consistently with the safety of the community. Yet here is a distinct intimation, that the intermediate depositaries of justice attempted a bargain with the crown, for surrendering its prerogative of revision, and refused to act unless they might be permitted to carry a halter in their pockets. No honest man can hesitate to avow his belief, that an individual who, by supposition, could have been guilty of such an atrocity, ought to dangle at the end of his own string;—what possible motive, therefore can the Quarterly Review have at this moment, for holding forth such a libel on the judges and the crown, without proof and by the mere fiat of its imagina-

---

of these brave and faithful Soldiers, whose unmerited privations and sufferings are an eternal disgrace to the Government of France.

'The following Donations which came to hand yesterday, are included in the general Advertisement list:—

FROM A CAPTAIN,

'Who requests the acceptance of 5*l.* in aid of the Fund for the Relief of the late brave and loyal French Royal Guard.

FROM A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT.

'Sir—I enclose two guineas for the Relief of the brave Royal Guards of France—a tribute to their valour, constancy, and loyalty, under the most trying circumstances.

FROM A LIEUTENANT-COLONEL.

'As a tribute to military fidelity.—10*l.*

FROM A CLERGYMAN OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

'In aid of the Subscription to the Fund for the Relief of the French Guards, who as soldiers nobly performed their duty.—10*l.*

[with many others.]

If the intention was to intimate that the British army would be to be depended on in the supposed possibility of an attempt to put down public freedom and establish despotism like that in Paris, the writer takes leave to declare, on the credit of twenty-five years acquaintance with the officers and soldiers of that army, that there are not two officers and twenty men per regiment who would act in furtherance of such an attempt from the moment there was time to be aware of its nature. They would do as they did in 1688; "Eyes Centre" and go over in squadron. There is nothing new in this; it is the constitutional security contemplated by the oracles of British law. The recognition of such a certainty, is the basis of the existing compact by which the direction of the army is committed to the crown.

The same journal has thought fit to menace the Lord Chancellor with the army. It may depend on it, if ever the question is raised, the army will be with the Lord Chancellor.

tion? But this is what its party, if it had the power, not only *would* do, but even now complains was not carried into execution. The lesson is an important one, and will not be lost upon the public. It may be very doubtful whether the borough-mongers, if they got the upper hand, would succeed in finding a Jefferies upon the bench; but it is certain that they would *try* to find something incomparably more atrocious and detestable than Jefferies himself has ever been painted by his enemies.

A word has been dropped in one place upon "republicans." This may lead to a profitable explanation. There would be no doubt of the Quarterly Review being right if it believed, that there are numerous classes of persons in this country, who have the same intimate persuasion that republican government is intrinsically the best calculated for the welfare of the governed, that they have that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points. There is no more secret in this, than in there being men who read geometry. These are not times for persecuting for an opinion; and if speculative absolutists go unburned, republicans may. But then these same individuals are among the last who would refuse to use the road between London and Edinburgh, till all the crooked was made straight and the rough places plain. They see clearly that the impediment to republican institutions in England, is the legitimate wealth and influence of the aristocracy,—the wealth and influence which they derived from sources antecedent to the present condition of society, and which they brought with them when they submitted to the compact by which they rose from plundering barons into the hereditary leaders of a free people; and this arrangement necessitates a king, for the public safety. Not that they would pay a sixpence, either by fraud or consent, towards keeping up the wealth of the aristocracy; but finding it there, they are content to take it as it is. And they are not convinced, that a government of this form is not capable of discharging the offices expected from it by the community. If anybody will convince them of that fact, they will act accordingly. But in the mean time they wish to go on as they are; they desire, and they think they see, the favourable solution of the problem, whether a constitutional monarchy is competent to the purposes of good government. But then their coalition manifestly depends upon the government being good. If it is not to be good, then all these classes are in a state of virtual or avowed hostility. It is for the government to chuse, whether it will have them on its side or not. They are here, ready to do all that can fairly be required of them; but if they are to be told that they are odious and monsters, because they believe a

republic to be abstractedly the best form of government, they will consider the hostility as an avowal that it is intended the government shall be bad. Republicanism, hurts nobody that is honest. The fear and outcry against republics in foreign countries, is only like the outcry of a parish which should say to its neighbours, "One thing we must particularly request of you, as essential to maintaining the relations of peace and amity; and that is, that in your parish there shall be no accounts. We cannot stand accounts; we can endure anything but accounts." The government which keeps up a bugbear opposition to republics in other countries, or sacrifices fair political advantages to such an apprehension, declares in language that cannot be mistaken, that it has something bad to protect at home. There is no warfare between republics, and *just* monarchical governments; the interminable hostility is with the *unjust*. On this point, perhaps, the existing ministry have committed the greatest error,—and everybody commits some,—that has befallen during their tenure of office. It was an object of serious national importance, that a government should have been established in Belgium which would have been interested in maintaining its independence. Everybody knew that the natural tendency of the Belgians was to republican institutions, and that it was only kept down by the sentiment of weakness, and the desire of some shopkeepers of Brussells to live on the expenses of a king. A word from the English ministry would have established a government which would have struggled to the last against all fusion with any foreign power. This chance was thrown away, through the paltry dread of seeing an honest government so near home. If excuses can be found in the fact that circumstances were not the same as now, it would not yet be too late to change the policy *.

---

* Before leaving the Quarterly Review, it appears necessary to notice a passage in a preceding Number, though on a subject not immediately connected with the present.

In the Quarterly Review for January 1831, is the passage which is given in the left-hand column below with the answer on the right.

'But this was the age of innovation and experiment. Even Jeremy Bentham's illustrious project of manufacturing rogues and harlots into honest men and women was taken up by the government upon a great scale; and on the fetid and unwholesome swamp, which the projector had purchased for his Utopian seminary, a Penitentiary was erected, at a cost which might have sufficed for founding and endowing a third university, or establishing a colony in Australia upon a nobler foun-

In 1792 Mr. Bentham gave a plan to the government for building a Penitentiary on 80 acres of land in Battersea Rise, which had been allotted to that purpose in virtue of an Act of Parliament arising out of a proposal which originated with Sir William Blackstone and Mr. Eden (afterwards Lord Auckland). A jury valued the land at about 6000*l*. Mr. Bentham's plan was to contain a thousand prisoners, at an expense of 27*l*. a head; and they were to be maintained by contract, at 12*l*. a

It may perhaps be unfair in the actual position of things, to compare past acts too narrowly with what may be hoped hereafter. There is no doubt that the estrangement which had long been growing between the Whigs and the community at large, has, by one energetic step into the right, been removed and made as if it had never been existent. There are few political differences, not based in positive ill intent on either side, which are not extinguishable by such an effort. The Whigs are now as they were in 1688, the acknowledged leaders of the community against the common enemy. If office is their wish,—and with their habits and political education there is no reason why it should not,—they may hold it for ever and for ever, and set up the Ultra-Liberals, (as perhaps they call them in their *penetralia*), as a constitutional opposition. This last class includes the numerical majority of the community, and has no defect of ability for such a duty; though, with a single exception*, they have no more desire for office than Mr. Bentham has to be Lord Chancellor. It is not desired to be hard upon honest men for non-essential differences; but the supporters of absolute power in all countries, the advocates for putting down the press by means of military fidelity, the men who call the principles of freedom an infection and liberty a disease, may be squeezed out of all power and influence to an eternity of hopelessness. The Ultra-Liberals, if that be their name, make no compact as to what they will wish for afterwards; the theory of their being an opposition, implies that they will wish for something which the ministers do not. But this they will be pledged for, that all they desire shall be pursued by legitimate and moderate means, and that they and their adherents count on nothing but that gradual and wholesome cession to the progress of public opinion, which makes at once the glory and the safety of a free country.

Since the above was prepared for printing, the ministers have had the ingenuity to put themselves into a minority upon

---

dation that any modern colony that has ever proceeded from Europe. There it stands—a monument at once of Jeremy's philosophico-philofelon-philanthropy, of national folly, and of the futility of all such schemes of reformation. Well would it be if this were the only price which the nation has paid—or is likely to pay—for its lessons in Jeremy-Benthamism!!'—*Quarterly Review, No. LXXXVII, p. 277.*

head per annum. The plan was accepted by government; but afterwards it appeared there was an obstacle, which obstacle was the personal dislike of the reigning sovereign to Mr. Bentham. The end was, that the plan was not carried into effect; and that the government built their own Penitentiary, in their own place, (which the Quarterly Review says is a fetid swamp), and at an expense which has been estimated at 1000*l.* a head for each prisoner.

The only observation which will be added is, that a political party is badly led, whose leaders compromise it by mis-statements like the above.

* Mr. Cobbett had avowed his desire to be prime minister.

a matter of detail. As has happened before now, the errors of the leaders must be repaired by the exertions of the followers. There is a regular combination of all the interests, which ride in coaches at the expense of the industrious and middle classes; and the fact creates an additional demand on every individual of those classes, to demonstrate his sentiments by all the means which Providence has placed at his disposal. The Tories are of that order of spirits, which are not cast out without fasting and prayer. They will struggle to the last, like a bear robbed of her whelps; they will display the natural fury which the ancients called στοργὴ, in defence of the inheritance of their younger children. The thing will not go on without a Dissolution; but it will, with that. To settle it without, would be an injustice to the commons.—Who, that could command a corporal's guard, would have contrived to get beaten on the Friday on a Timber question? It seems fated that the world shall know, how much was owing to the feeling of the country, and how little to skill. "Honest" they may be, "as ever broke bread;" but still, as Dogberry stipulates, "all men are not alike."

The Second Reading has been carried by a majority of one. A miss is as good as a mile; and the effects of the former blunder will probably be got over.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 April, 1831.

ART. XVII.—*Speech of the Marquis* WIELOPOLSKI, *at the Public Dinner given at the Crown and Anchor on the 9th of March* 1831, *to celebrate the Polish Revolution.* Translated from the French Manuscript.—London. Ridgway.

POLAND is *not* defeated. Our base domestic enemies, the friends of tyranny every-where because they hope to bring it to our homes and to our hearths,—who when it please the gods to bring them to those mills of theirs which "grind slow*" but grind small, shall be comminuted into something less than the impalpable,—these inward traitors and house vermin exulted in the persuasion that while a gallant man was addressing an assemblage of freemen as the representative of his country, that country was overwhelmed by the barbarian. It was a mean falsehood,—concocted by one arbitrary government to help another; a foul invention of the Devil's Own, after the manner of the father whom they serve, and propagated joyfully by their relations in all degrees, for the chance of checking or procrastinating the progress of freedom in some portion of the earth.

Poland still stands; but where is *young France?* Sunk in

---

*—τοῖς ὀψὲ δὴ τούτοις ἀλεῖν λεγομένοις μύλοις τῶν θεῶν.—*Plutarch. De Serâ Numinis Vindictâ.*

disgrace in comparison of which the occupation of her capital by barbarians was glory and romantic honour. Buried under a load of shame, to which a priest-ridden lieutenant of the Cossacks in the Tuileries was dignity and happiness. There was no consent; the body cannot be dishonoured, the seat of violation is in the mind; the brave men our brothers fought with, were not to blame. There is no disgrace in being militarily conquered after resisting to the last. No man is ashamed of Laon or Montmartre; or creeps into a corner to conceal the fact of having fought for France at Mont St. Jean. Frenchmen were not pointed at through Europe, for having been overpowered by the forces of foreign despots after a great military misfortune. Submitting to treachery at home, is what brings with it personal degradation; it is this which will make Frenchmen hear in the streets of London, "V'là un français!—*qui n'a pas consenti à l'occupation de l'Italie!*"

After the expulsion of the elder branch of the Bourbons, the French were told they were to have a throne with republican institutions. It is not quite clear who said this, or where; but it was enough for the drawers that the bill was put in circulation, though neither the acceptors nor endorsers were very plainly to be made out. When the bill became due, it appeared that republican institutions meant the Chamber of Charles X. But time had been gained, which was what the drawers wanted. The fowling-pieces that had won the Three Days, had been returned into their nooks; and an impulse which had been fifteen years in collecting, was not likely to be renewed at a moment's warning. Here then was fraud the first, upon that always practicable and always cheated victim the community. The men of the Restoration came forth, and looked smooth things; and the honest citizens who had expelled the foreign usurpation, trusted to "*les habiles*," and "*les habiles*" as might be expected, showed their ability by catering for themselves. All men began to see, that the new government was playing into the hands of the old legitimacy; and that its object was to do no more than should prevent the nation from overthrowing it like its predecessor, and offer all the people were defrauded of, as a bribe to obtain the tolerance of the legitimates. It was to be put to the moderation of the lawful sovereigns, whether they would be content with three-fourths of the old misgovernment in France, or run the risk of what might happen in the endeavour to secure the whole. The rulers by the grace of God, gave tardy and uncertain symptoms of consent. That is to say, they did not march on France, because they were not ready. Each party dissimulated for time; the foreigners to prepare their field batteries, and the other to gain the hold in France which

should save them from the ejectment they feared. But as the plot thickened, the inherent object of the French government became apparent. It opposed the destruction of the absolute governments of the Peninsula, when a simple leaving them to their fate would have effected their removal. In this manner it secured a strong diversion in the South, whenever the time should come for inviting the French people to make terms. But a stronger case soon arose. The Colossus of the North put its legions in movement upon Paris. The advanced guard of the invading army turned round at Warsaw, and declared for France. Whereon the government, "*les habiles*," sent word to the Poles that they were obliged to them, that they wished them well, but the system of the generals of the citizen king was to wait till the Russians arrived at Dijon and the army of the faith was at Toulouse. A more manifest military treachery never beamed upon the world. There is not a squadron of horse or a company of foot, where the corporals would not put the captain in confinement and carry him to camp for judgment, on a similar act of gross complicity with the enemy. But even this was not all. In the earlier stages of the proceeding, it had suited the government to use great words. They were necessary at that moment to keep up the adherence of the people; and therefore the government declared, that "France would not consent" to the interference of foreigners any-where. It declined a crusade for the purpose of giving all discontented nations the mastery over their domestic oppressors; but it engaged that it would prevent the introduction of foreigners to settle the dispute. The interest the French nation had in this, was manifest and clear; but it was the nation which had the interest, and the interest of the government was on the other side. The time for proving whether the declaration was truth or fraud, speedily arrived. Many of the oppressed portions of Europe, trusting to the manifest motives the French people had for not uttering a bullying falsehood through the organ of its government, set themselves in opposition to their domestic tyrants, and looked to France for the fulfillment of her promise. And now see how the land of gallant men and beautiful women is to escape out of the difficulty. "*France will not consent*"—says the representative of Gallic honour—meant "*France will not give it in writing that she is pleased with the conclusion.*" In this state the affair stands at present; and it remains to be proved whether the Punic faith of the ministry is the measure of the honour of individuals in the land of the tricolor.

The one, simple inference from the totality of the conduct of the French government since July, is that it is negotiating for

the moment when it may advise the French people to capitulate. If the French mean to do so, they had better do it now; for they would get better terms, than when Dijon is in the hands of the enemy. It is more than probable, that at the present moment the legitimate sovereigns would be content with the Restoration of the Duc de Bordeaux, and Alsace. It cannot be expected, that when they have had the trouble of conquering Poland and Italy, they will be satisfied with so little. At this instant the French would get full allowance for all the chances they consented to give up; but when those chances have been surrendered one by one by the agency of their government, they cannot pretend to charge the Holy Allies with them again. It is the mere calculation of a profit-and-loss account, whether they will gain more by surrendering point-blank now, receiving proper compensation for the allies they abandon and the chances they give up (and England perhaps would interfere to obtain them fair play);—or whether they will try the chances after their allies have been overpowered piecemeal, and forced to service in the ranks of the enemy.

It is true that war is an evil; but war is to prevent war. War in the country of allies abroad, to prevent war without allies at home. No man sits down to have his throat cut, in order to escape the danger of resistance; it is only governments, acting for those under them, that give into such absurdity. The point for the French people to determine is, not whether they will go without war altogether, but whether they will encounter the honourable risks of war, to escape the dishonourable certainties of submission to barbarians. Nobody supposes the French nation will bow to these, without a war at last; the question therefore is, whether it shall make war with success abroad, or war without success at home, after its leaders have surrendered all the good positions to the enemy. If the Poles and Italians are overpowered through French desertion, they are to blame if they do not enter France in the rear of the Cossacks, and take what compensation they are able out of the chattels of the recreants. Men are not to be deceived for nothing; and if the French make themselves odious through Europe by treachery, retribution will take its own time to make them sensible of their fault.

It was precisely in this way, that the government of Louis XVI went to its destruction, and brought his particular head to the block. The thing that has been, is the thing that shall be; except in so far as the latter part may be modified by the spirit of the age, into an occupancy of one of the many mansions in the heaven of Holyrood. The first citizen-monarchy made all manner of promises to the people; and it is not certain that

in the ardour of the moment it did not intend to keep them. But it quickly found metal more attractive. It had the option of going forwards and standing, and it chose to go backwards and fall. Evidence was soon given, that it was operating in the interest of the foreigner, and that the tears of joy were in bottle, and the handkerchiefs steeped in lavender, which were to be used when the Austrians should enter by the Barrière de Clichy. The present government probably contemplates a kind of *mezzo termine*. It means to say at the proper moment, "You see that all the great positions are in the hands of the enemy; your allies have all submitted, Europe in arms is at your doors; and here are we, citizen king as we are, ready to make the best possible terms either for ourselves or for our cousin." What tears of rapture there will be, what waving of handkerchiefs, what hoisting of table-cloths with mustard on them or without, the day the white and Russian flags appear together on the column of the brave! This is what the French new army is brought to Paris to protect. Young men in these days love a whole skin; the way to maintain a dishonourable peace, is to appeal to the recruits that would have to make the war.

Does anybody love war? If he does, he is a beast and not a man. But war is the choice of minor evils; and when this choice is offered, it may lawfully be embraced with joy. War is the voluntary risking of one member of a family, to keep the Cossack out of his sister's bedchamber. The man who declines doing this, had better hold the door and make the best bargain he can for himself, when the enemy has crossed the Rhine of his threshold, and invested the fortresses of his porch and his fireside.

One of the most important parts of the Speech of the Polish Envoy, is that which relates to the obligations on the present British Ministry to maintain their character for consistency by supporting the cause of Poland, and the comparative facilities for its execution. If the Ministers have any reliance on the good opinion of the friends of liberty throughout the country, the intimations contained in it will not be without effect.

'I need not now go back further than the Congress of Vienna, where your country was represented by the late Lord Castlereagh. You belong to a nation, Gentlemen, which knows how to render justice to all. We too in Poland like to do the same. We cannot but be pleased with the efforts of Lord Castlereagh in our favour; there are documents to prove his good intentions. A noble Duke, and another noble Lord, were also present at Vienna on the part of this country. It is said, that they manifested opinions the most favourable to our cause, and of which the Poles entertain the most grateful

sense. They encountered difficulties that arose from another quarter. Russia then occupied the greater portion of the Polish territory, and formally refused to make restitution. The illustrious persons I have mentioned, were then reproached by the opposition with not having done enough for our cause. The speeches pronounced in the House of Commons, by a noble Lord, who now presides in another august assembly, are still fresh in memory. Those who then formed the Opposition, now form the Ministry. And how great the change that has since been operated, in respect to the position of Poland! The dangers with which Europe has been menaced, on the part of Russia, posterior to the Congress of Vienna, have been augmented by the war in Turkey, and the well known designs of the Cabinet of St. Petersburg against France and Belgium. Hence, there are new reasons for desiring the re-establishment of Poland. Is this re-establishment more difficult to effect at the present moment than at the period of the Congress of Vienna? Most certainly, Gentlemen, the very reverse. To effect this object, then, it would have been necessary to make war with Russia. At the present moment this war is already made by the Poles themselves, who, by an extraordinary effort, have succeeded in arresting in their territory the colossus, while on the way to the very centre of Europe, in order to crush civilization. The question now is, only not to abandon the Poles in this struggle, in which they are contesting for the liberty and independence of nations. What course will your Government pursue?—This we know, that it is composed of men who respect public opinion, who have even shown, too, that they ask its support. Gentlemen, the public opinion of England can do much for us. With all the calmness and maturity by which your counsels are characterized, examine our cause in all its bearings; form your opinion thereupon, and then announce it candidly, announce it in every way. The Poles will never ask anything unreasonable; habituated as they are to sacrifice themselves for others, they are still very far from demanding that other nations should sacrifice themselves in their cause; but they have a right to hope, and they do hope, most firmly, that they shall not be abandoned in the hour of their utmost need. What, then, is to be the future destiny of my country? Let us form a judgment of it from the past. After every new reverse that seemed to threaten to annihilate her for ever, Poland has risen, superior to this reverse, and invigorated by calamity. Gentlemen, I have already said, that our liberty and yours were contemporary. You have shown yourselves great, by preserving this birthright, and by developing it, by strengthening it; ours has been wrested from us: but, Gentlemen, as a Pole, I can look every Englishman in the face without blushing: in the slavery we have been compelled to undergo, we have not lost our time, we have been learning to re-conquer our liberty, and preserve our national honour,—the honour of John Sobieski, the saviour of Vienna; the honour of Kosciuszko, Dombrowski, Poniatowski, which has been found entire in the honour of Radziwil, and the warriors whom he commanded. We have been learning to preserve your esteem.'

'We firmly believe, that to destroy the existence of Poland, it will

be necessary to exterminate the very last of the Poles. But this, we trust, Europe will not suffer; we believe that the opinion of the people will have the effect of making it impossible that governments should not afford us succour.'

'Gentlemen, as to myself, individually, I am of opinion, that the question now, is, not of the option of supporting or abandoning us, but of an option as to the manner in which that succour can be afforded. There is, besides, a species of succour that the people can afford us, independently of their Government. We have placed at the disposal of our country, all our blood, and all our fortunes; we are led to hope that our friends will consecrate a portion of their's to succour and support us. Already have our generous friends, the French, set the example, by numerous collections and subscriptions that have been opened; doubtless, the English will not suffer themselves to be out-stripped in the race of generosity. In depositing their offerings upon the altar of our liberty, not only will they afford us a substantial succour, they will also give a new proof, a yet untried manifestation of their sympathy for our cause,—a cause as noble, as it is unfortunate.'—*pp.* 13—17.

It is one thing for men to blame political opponents, and another to act justly themselves. After the Lords Castlereagh and Aberdeen and the Duke of Wellington have been reproached for not doing enough for Poland when she was under the yoke, the country will be curious to note the precise quantity of what a reforming Ministry does for her now she is in arms.

PROGRAMME to the WESTMINSTER REVIEW for 1 July, 1831.

THE present Number is issued at a moment when there is great uncertainty on many of the points affecting the progress of the political measure to which all attention in Great Britain is just now directed; though on some of them the uncertainty may be at an end before the Number is in the reader's hands. Does the Church mean to chronicle itself an institution incompatible with the existence of Reform? Have the Lords determined to risk all the consequences to their country that might ensue, from their declaring themselves unable to endure that the House of Commons should reform itself? One thing however is clear,—that neither of these events will occur, without the parties having exerted that grave deliberation, which will preserve them from useless regrets at any of the possible results. To the community at large, who are neither peers nor churchmen, but what the Church of England in her Homilies gracefully denominates "the rude and rascal commons," it is scarcely necessary to intimate, that uncertainty should imply readiness for all events,—that nothing is lost by being prepared,—

that the halcyon days of success should be employed in making provisions which will be wished for in a darker hour,—and that no prospect, however flattering, should induce the slightest remission of the general energy, which is the sole foundation of all justice, and by which alone the most modified diminution of evil will be either obtained or preserved.

In France there appear symptoms of a disposition to attempt a real Revolution, and to replace that country among the efficient powers of Europe. The opinion of the most intelligent liberals there appears to be, that the individual to whom the guidance of affairs has been committed, is wholly in the hands of the Holy Alliance; that he will go on as long as he can, and then abdicate. If this happens before the completion of the reform in England, it will come in aid as an example of the danger of trifling with an intelligent people. The Belgians are in the act of struggling against the fraud of the Protocols. Diplomacy, (from the Greek,) is the science of signing one thing and doing another. The Belgians have only to resist, and they may rest assured of ultimate success, Their error began when they thought of truckling to the remnants of Holy Alliance statesmanship, and will end when they set them at defiance. Neither the English nor the French people will go to war against their own interests, to support a palpable fraud on a weak nation. Poland is to be left unaided, because "policy does not allow of interference, however just the cause." In other words, because in the existing state of Europe, the governing powers have a lurking interest in improving the general chances in favour of oppression. The same argument would prove, that individuals should sit still when their neighbour's house is robbed, and so wait quietly till the robbery reaches to themselves. Men have amended this in their internal regulations. When men are their own politicians, perhaps they will amend the other also.

The latest accredited rumour is, that the Lords are determined to resist the reformation of the House of Commons. If they do, they will make a republic one and indivisible. With a view to preventing grave evils, ought not towns and counties without delay to send petitions by the proper delegates, praying the Crown to exercise, as on past occasions, its power of creating peers?

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 July, 1831.

ART. VII.—*Annals and Antiquities of Rajast'han, or the Central and Western Rajpoot States of India.* By Lieutenant-Colonel James Tod, late Political Agent to the Western Rajpoot States. Vol. I.—London; Smith, Elder, and Co. 1829. pp. 806.

'RAJAST'HAN* is the collective and classical denomination of that portion of India which is "the abode of (Rajpoot) princes;"' that is to say, of such as, with their people, rejoice in distinguishing themselves by the title of Rajpoots. What may have been its nominal extent before the earliest Mohammedan conquests, it does not seem possible to define. But previously to the erection of the minor Mohammedan monarchies in Malwa and Guzzerat which are known to have been cut out of it at later periods, the term would have been appropriated to a space between the Indus and the Jumna, extending nearly from 22° to 30° North latitude, and 69° to 78° East longitude, including an area of 350,000 square miles.

Distinguished from the inhabitants of the rest of the Peninsula by their traditions, and by numerous differences in manners and opinions, though in other points agreeing with the mass, these tribes present an object of curiosity to the historian; and much interest is attached to any information touching the probable manner in which the original Rajpoots came into India, and the date of their migration. And here the two principal facts supported by the results of inquiry appear to be, First, that they were of Scythian origin, and cousins to the swárm which struck off north-westerly, and lighted, under Odin possibly, in Scandinavia; and Secondly, that their migration took place at a period earlier than the events in India to which allusion is found in Greek or Roman history, and consequently the Rajpoots are the successors, and, with little alteration, the representatives, of the races which occupied the country beyond the Indus in the days of Alexander and of Cyrus.

'The religion of the martial Rajpoot, and the rites of Har, the god of battle, are little analogous to those of the meek Hindus, the followers of the pastoral divinity, the worshippers of kine, and feeders on fruits, herbs, and water. The Rajpoot delights in blood: his offerings to the god of battle are sanguinary, blood and wine: the cup of libation is the human skull. He loves them because they are emblematic of the deity he worships; and he is taught to believe that Har loves them, who in war is represented with the skull to drink the foeman's blood, and in peace is the patron of wine and women. With Parbutti on his knee, his eyes rolling from the juice of the p'fool and opium, such is this Bacchanalian divinity of war. Is this Hinduism,

* '*From raj* "regal," and *t'han* "dwelling."'

acquired on the burning plains of India? Is it not rather a perfect picture of the manners of the Scandinavian heroes?'

'The Rajpoot slays buffaloes, hunts and eats the boar and deer, and shoots ducks and wild fowl; he worships his horse, his sword, and the sun, and attends more to the martial song of the bard than to the litany of the Bramin. In the martial mythology and warlike poetry of the Scandinavians a wide field exists for assimilation, and a comparison of the poetical remains of the Asi of the east and west would alone suffice to suggest a common origin.'

'In the sacred *Bardai* of the Rajpoot we have the bard of our Saxon ancestry.—The Valkyrie, or fatal sisters of the Suevi or Siebi, would be the twin sisters of the Apsaras, who summon the Rajpoot warrior from the field of battle, and bear him to "*the mansion of the sun*," equally the object of attainment with the children of Odin in Scandinavia, and of Boodha and Soorya in the plains of Scythia and on the Ganges, like the Elysium of the Heliadæ of Greece.'

'The war-chariot is peculiar to the Indu-Scythic nations, from Désarat'ha* and the heroes of the Mahabharat, to the conquest of Hindust'han by the Mahomedans, when it was laid aside. On the plains of Coorukhéta, Crishna became charioteer to his friend Arjoon; and the Getic hordes of the Jaxartes, when they aided Xerxes in Greece, and Darius on the plains of Arbela, had their chief strength in the war-chariot.'

'The war-chariot continued to be used later in the south-west of India than elsewhere, and the Catti, Comani, Comari, of Saurashtra have to recent times retained their Scythic habits, as their monumental stones testify, expressing their being slain from their cars.'—*p.* 68—69.

The Germans, says Tacitus, deemed the advice of a woman in periods of exigence oracular. So does the Rajpoot, as the bard Chund often exemplifies. To a German mind, says Tacitus, the idea of a woman led into captivity is insupportable; and the Rajpoots when besieged and without hope of relief, destroy their women, and then, after dressing themselves in yellow, refuse quarter and rush upon destruction. In passion for play, the Rajpoots will stand the comparison with either Scythian or German. Divination by lots, auguries, and omens by flights of birds, as practised by the Getic nations described by Herodotus, and amongst the Germans by Tacitus, will be found among the Rajpoots.

'Love of liquor, and indulgence in it to excess, were deep-rooted in the Scandinavian Asi and German tribes, and in which they showed their Getic origin; nor is the Rajpoot behind his brethren either of Scythia or Europe. It is the free use of this and similar indulgences, prohibited by ordinances which govern the ordinary Hindu, that first induced me to believe that these warlike races were little indebted to India.'

* 'This title of the father of Rama denotes a "charioteer."'

'The Rajpoot welcomes his guest with the *mumwar peala*, or 'cup of request,' in which they drown ancient enmities. The heroes of Odin never relished a cup of mead more than the Rajpoot his *madhva*; and the bards of Scandinavia and Rajwarra are alike eloquent in the praise of the bowl, on which the Bardai exhausts every metaphor, and calls it ambrosial, immortal. "The bard, as he sipped the ambrosia, in which sparkled the ruby seed of the pomegranate, rehearsed the glory of the race of the fearless. May the king live for ever, alike bounteous in gifts to the bard and the foe!"'—*p.* 71.

The analogies between the habits of the Rajpoot and those generated by the feudal system in Europe, are of continual occurrence. The poorest Rajpoot retains all the pride of ancestry; he scorns to hold the plough, or to use his lance but on horseback. In war the Rajpoots employ heraldic bearings on their banners; and every royal house has its palladium, which is frequently borne to battle at the saddle-bow of the prince. Their ancestors who opposed Alexander, did the same, and carried the image of Hercules (*Baldeva*) at the head of their army.

'No finer picture of feudal manners exists than the history of Pirt'hwirájá, contained in Chund's poem. It is surprising that this epic should have been allowed so long to sleep neglected: a thorough knowledge of it, and of others of the same character, would open many sources of new knowledge, and enable us to trace many curious and interesting coincidences. Domestic habits and national manners are painted to the life, and no man can well understand the Rajpoot of yore, who does not read these. Those were the days of chivalry and romance, when the assembled princes contended for the hand of the fair, who chose her own lord, and threw to the object of her choice, in full court, the *bur-mala*, or garland of marriage. Those were the days which the Rajpoot yet loves to talk of, when the glance of an eye weighed with a sceptre: when three things alone occupied him; his horse, his lance, and his mistress: for she is but the third in his estimation, after all: to the two first he owed her.'—*p.* 139.

Besides the burning of widows, which is common to other parts of the Peninsula, and the custom of destroying the women at the conclusion of the unsuccessful defence of a town, the numbers of the Rajpoot females are thinned in their earliest moments by infanticide. The origin of this last practice is traced to the difficulty of disposing of daughters in marriage which arises from the distinctions of clan, and the expenditure which custom has made necessary on the marriage of a daughter. "Until vanity suffer itself to be controuled, and the aristocratic Rajpoot submit to republican simplicity," says the author, "the evils arising from nuptial profusion will not cease." [*p.* 367.] If expiring Toryism should think it has a glimpse of the surviving beauty of feudal institutions in Rajast'han, let it by no means forget to add infanticide to the list.

The volume includes a History of the Rajpoot Tribes, and Annals of Méwar, besides a Personal Narrative of the Author's Journey to Marwar; the whole affording evidence of the extent to which the agents of Indian policy conduct their researches, and of the liberal spirit which, whatever exceptions may have presented themselves in past history, forms one principal source of the extension and permanence of the British power in the East.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 July, 1831.

ART. XVI.—1. *Traité des grandes Opérations militaires.* Par le Général Baron De Jomini; 3 vols. in 8vo. avec atlas.—Paris. 1811.

2. *Introduction à l'étude des grandes combinaisons de la stratégie et de la tactique, notamment au Traité des grandes Opérations militaires.* Par le Baron De Jomini.—Paris. Anselin. 1830.

THE military system of Napoleon was a subject of which the interest might in some sort be said to have gone by, till the changes in the actual and in the probable state of the world, resulting from the late abortive attempt at revolution in France, brought it once more before the notice of the public. When there is a war *à l'outrance* in one part of Europe, with every probability of its being terminated, as other wars have been, between the Loire and the Garonne,—the theory which in its day produced greater results than mankind had ever before witnessed, becomes an object of intense interest, not so much for its effects on the contest which may be next immediately impending, as on the struggle which will not commence till feebleness and treachery have received their just reward.

It was much the fashion among the authors and conductors of the two French wars, to maintain that Napoleon *had* no system; that his successes were owing to anything, except genius in the individual, and applicability in his practice to the case of a nation struggling, as France was in all the earlier and brightest part of his career, against foreign interference. And it was not till comparatively near the close of his eventful course,—at a period, in fact, coincident with the appearance of the remarkable book named at the head of this Article,—that any light was formally offered to guide the speculations of the soldier, the statesman, or the historian, or any attempt made to collect the scattered rays which were to be sought for in the bulletins of a series of campaigns and victories. The conqueror and the conquests have passed away; the humbler of kings lies on the rock where he was "done to death" by that English oligarchy which is now so near its own extinction, and his column waits to be delivered up for the third time to the tender

mercies of the barbarian; but when all this shall have been completed, the book of Jomini will be the monument *ære perennius*, which will present the school-boy of Brienne as the establisher of the independence of nations, and the military liberator of a future Europe.

The truth was, that as is the case with all great inventions, the leading principles of the discoveries of Napoleon might be conveyed in an exceedingly small compass. The Baron Jomini himself, though possessing great knowledge of the details, and with the advantage (at one time denied, but finally confirmed by the avowal of Napoleon) of personal communication with the author of the discoveries, has not been so clear and precise as it is permitted to be after twenty years further familiarity with the facts. The following extract is from the "Subsidiary Observations" attached to the Tenth Chapter (on Defensive Force) of Mr. Bentham's Constitutional Code by one of his *aides-de-camp**; in which the question has been compressed into the smallest space.

'Hitherto the subject has been that of different armatures or modes of arming, or what the French distinguish more briefly by the word *arme*. The next is, of the mode of applying them. And these two subjects have manifestly a degree of inter-connexion with each other. Arms of a particular kind are chosen, from an opinion that they are the most effectual for the conduct of war; and war is conducted in one certain manner and not in another, in consequence of a reference to the nature of the arms in use.'

'The great division which presents itself in this place, is the division into *tactics* and *strategics*. It is remarkable, that after all that has been written on the military art, men in general have not yet come to a clear and vernacular comprehension of the difference between these two things. Even Jomini (the last military author of name, and the only one who has written intelligibly on the rationale of the movements of armies†,) is not clear upon it. *Tactics* (from τάσσω *ordino*) are the preparation of the instruments. *Strategics* (from στρατὸν ἄγω) are how to apply them after they are made. To mix colours, prepare canvas, and chuse brushes, may be said to be the tactics of a painter. Strategics, are how to paint. To know *how* to form columns, lines, to advance, to retire, &c. is tactics. To know *when*

* See Art. on *Defensive Force*, West. Rev. for Jan. 1831. *p.* 337 of this Vol.

† '*Traité des grandes Opérations militaires. Par le Général Baron de Jomini*; 3 *vol. in* 8*vo. avec atlas*; 40 *fr.—Paris*, 1811. The book is an *exposé* of the military system of Napoleon. When France was invaded in 1813, Jomini went over to the Allies; and altered the subsequent editions of his book, to please his new associates. The later editions are consequently diminished in value. There are also several volumes professing to be a continuation; but of inferior interest. In 1830 the same author published, *Introduction à l'étude des grandes combinaisons de la stratégie et de la tactique, notamment au Traité des grandes Opérations militaires. Anselin, Paris*, 2 *fr.*; which is a kind of syllabus of the other, with additions.'

to form columns, when lines, when to advance, when to retire, &c. is strategics.'

'There may be a small *tactique* and a *grande tactique*,—a tactic of companies, and a tactic of regiments, and a tactic of *corps d'armée*,—a tactic of infantry, of cavalry, and of artillery; but they all agree in the definition given.'

'The divisions existing in strategics were never clearly developed, till it was done by Napoleon. The *strategic of battles* was indifferently well understood before his time, and had received great improvements, as connected with the modern weapons, from the King of Prussia; but the rules for the direction of forces at a distance from the enemy, were in a very different state. The leading principle of this strategic of battles, may be stated as derived from the fact, that when a force drawn up (as in the greater number of cases, since the invention of fire-arms, forces must necessarily be drawn up) in long thin lines, was attacked by other forces which had placed themselves in the direction of the smaller dimension of the line, or in other words upon one or both of its flanks, it was almost sure to be defeated; or at all events the chances were greatly against it, unless counterbalanced by extraordinary activity in the commander and resolution in the troops. And the reason of this was evidently, that bodies thus attacked in the direction of their smaller dimension, are under an incapacity of offering any effectual defence or opposition, without, at all events, a change of position to prepare for it; and this change of position, when to be effected under the pressure of an enemy and because the enemy makes it necessary, is a very dangerous operation, and almost sure to end in disorder and rout. What was established therefore was, that in respect of positions in actual combat, the *central* position was the dangerous one, and to occupy the circumference of the circle (or in other words to surround or *turn* the enemy) was the desirable one. And here began the mistake, which Napoleon was born to correct, and conquered the European continent in setting right. What was true of bodies of troops in positions of actual combat, was assumed to be true of bodies at great distances from each other. Because an army was in a dangerous situation when it had another army on each of its flanks within cannon shot, it was assumed that an army in Germany was also in a dangerous situation, when it had one army on its flank in Italy and another in the Netherlands. The First Consul was the discoverer of the fallacy contained in this assumption, and of the true principle of what may, for distinction, be called the *grande stratégique*, or mode of directing the movements of armies at a distance from the enemy; and he made thereby the same kind of revolution in war, that Copernicus did in astronomy. He saw clearly, that so long as there was distance enough for the central army to have time to concentrate its operations on one of the divided forces on its flanks, without its movement being instantly discovered and interrupted by the pursuit of the other,—the chances were all in favour of the force occupying the central or interior position. And this (though other causes combined and aided) was the leading source of his military success, so far as it depended on the movements of armies. When

his enemies had by experience become acquainted with his system, they endeavoured to paralyze it by withdrawing before him without fighting; so as to disappoint him in the object of his movement, which was to destroy a part,—and thereby leave him no result but the labour of his march. And this was attended with considerable effect, in the particular circumstances of Napoleon; because time and victory were precious to him at that period. But it does not follow that the same system is applicable to general use. Where circumstances on the two sides approached to equality, the very practice of the retreating system would be an avowal of inferiority; and the commander of the other army would find opportunities of so directing his movements, that to retreat before him should lead him to some object equivalent to a victory.'

'It may appear matter of interminable regret, that such a discovery, which proved itself capable of changing the face of Europe, should have produced so little benefit to mankind at large. But the results are yet to come. The discovery of Napoleon has decided the ultimate independence of nations, by demonstrating that the most civilized and liberal portion of Europe, possesses the good military position against the less civilized powers which surround it. If France, for example, should ever again be attacked by such a coalition as at the commencement of her Revolution, the military principle developed by Napoleon would give her almost the certainty of repulsing the invaders, and finding the way to their capitals in return.'

'A practical inference of smaller extent is, that in the case of a national resistance in circumstances like those of Spain when it rose upon the French forces dispersed over the country in 1808, the object of the insurgents should be to unite concentrically into masses superior to the separate masses by which they happen to be surrounded, and then assume the offensive without a moment's delay, for the purpose of overpowering their enemies in detail; repeating the same process of concentration and attack, as often as circumstances shall direct. The first part of the contest must in fact be a race, to see which side can execute this kind of process with most celerity and vigour.'—*"Subsidiary Observations" to Ch. X of Bentham's Constitutional Code.*

These Observations were printed a few weeks before the attempt at revolution in July 1830. Of course that part of them which relates to the defensibleness of France against a coalition, supposed that she was defended by statesmen of ordinary integrity and military foresight; and not that she was given tied and bound into the hands of her enemies, after the sacrifice of all her positions and chances for defence. To secure the advantages of her central situation, manifestly implied the exertion of intense energy and unity of purpose. It was not a system to be executed by a conclave of old women; and the world has had full evidence of the truth of the bitter speech attributed to Napoleon, in which he declared that his death would show how nearly those he left behind him came under that category. Its principle was closely analogous in spirit

to that from which the English have derived their advantages at sea; and consisted mainly in the strong determination to *go* and fight, and not to *wait* and fight. All the world knows, that from the moment hostile forces were put in movement against Napoleon or his allies, the next news to be looked for was, that he had chosen his point and was to be heard of in the middle of them. The world knows also, where to look for the miserable contrast.

Next to this sweeping inversion of the principle of military operations, the most striking peculiarity of Napoleon's system was what has been denominated his theory *des grandes chances*, or "of chances in the long run;" consisting in the systematic and orderly selection of such times and modes of operation, as after the fullest recognition of the uncertainty of all human expectations in particular instances, should nevertheless, on the average and in the long run, leave the next to certainty of final advantage*. Such a theory could plainly only occur to an extensive dealer in war. It may perhaps be illustrated as follows. Suppose two armies, or nations, to carry on a protracted contest; and, for argument's sake, let neither side have any marked superiority in numbers, means, courage, or military skill, so far as this last is applied to the mere production of present success. Let it be supposed therefore, that the commander of one army is impressed with a perfect conviction, that out of twenty battles, sieges, or other operations in which he shall be engaged against his enemy, he shall gain ten and lose ten; but let him have the ingenuity to undertake his battles &c. at such moments and under such circumstances, that of the ten which he wins, each shall by its consequences be of twice as much advantage to himself and loss to his opponent, as each of the ten which he loses shall be of loss to himself and advantage to the other. As, for example, let him contrive that in the ten battles which he wins, the enemy shall be driven upon some natural obstacle, or hostile territory, of which the consequence shall be total or approximate destruction; and that in the ten which he is to lose, he shall retire with comparatively little damage. The commander who can do this,—or who, without standing upon the extreme case, can make any marked approach to the execution of a similar system on the great scale,—will conquer in the end by the effects of the theory *des grandes chances*. Or if it should happen that out of the twenty operations he only succeeds in eight, it is possible that the gains of these may overbalance all his losses. Still more will his final success be brilliant and de-

* Note the coincidence between the principle of this part of the military system of Napoleon, and that involved in the "Greatest-Happiness" theory of Bentham (*See pages* 183 *and* 244 *of this Vol. and elsewhere*). *Added in* 1839.

cisive, if he is able to add the vigour or good fortune which procures him victory in twelve.

It is easy to say, that this is what all men know and practise; just as it is easy to say that all men know and practise the way to get rich. But the experimental truth is, that all men *do not* know and practise the way to get rich. On the contrary, it is a secret reserved for few; and depends, like the other, less upon the turning up a lucky throw in a single insulated operation, than on a calculation of the results and tendencies of a number of operations sufficient to neutralize the effects of chance. The few men who get rich, get rich in this way; or if there is a still smaller number who get rich by prizes in the lottery, or assisting a disguised fairy in distress, the number is so infinitely small in comparison of the other, that it may be neglected altogether.

It is remarkable that Napoleon owed his ruin in Russia, to the neglect of an easy inference from this theory of chances. Every gambler who persists in playing "*double or quits*," must to a certainty lose all at last. Such a venture, therefore, can only be justifiable, where the case is desperate without it.

A necessary result of the theory of final chances in the hands of Napoleon, was to give extension to those branches of military force, which are most efficient in improving victory. On this ground it was, that the establishment of the French cavalry was at one time increased to ninety thousand men. A portion of these,—in one instance * between twenty and thirty thousand,—were moved towards the enemy on foot, and contributed to improve his defeat, on horses that had been taken from his own ranks. When the great soldier fell into decay, it was interesting to see how the small men, and the adjutants, applied themselves to debate whether a cavalry recruit was better or worse for being prepared to act on foot; without a glimpse of the principle on which the master-hand had employed this mode of service.

Another result of the same theory,—modified also by its connexion with the branch of it previously described,—was a more rigid examination than had previously been made, into the effect and utility of fortified places. When Napoleon had nearly all the fortresses in Europe in his own hands, he endeavoured, through the writings of Carnot and others, to induce an elevated idea of their importance in modern war. But this did not prevent the perception of the truth, that the effect of the new system had considerably reduced the comparative value which they held, either in reality or in the imaginations of mankind. So many individuals not military, amuse themselves with reading the gazettes, and speculating on what they would do with

* Campaign of Jena.

this or that fortress if they were generals or ministers of state, that it may not be unacceptable to give a summary of what appear to be the circumstances which decide the importance or non-importance of a fortress since the æra of Napoleon; extracted chiefly from the "Subsidiary Observations" attached to the work of Mr. Bentham formerly alluded to.

'The use of fortresses in modern war appears to be reducible entirely, or nearly so, to their effects upon communications. For example, a fortress which secures a certain passage to the possessor, and enables him to exclude his enemy from the same passage, is of the same value and effect as the possession of a gate, which lets in one man and keeps out another. It is in just continuation of this metaphor, that a fortress is sometimes styled "*a key*," "the key of a country," &c. A fortress which is the key to nothing, is in modern military estimation worth nothing, and would be better dismantled. Many ancient fortresses are thus situated, and therefore have been abandoned. But to have any effect in the way of a *key*, a fortress must be connected with some extensive local obstacle or difficulty, as for example, a river, or a chain of mountains. If there is to be a gate, there must also be something of the nature of a wall; for a fortress in an open country, or on a plain of ice, would be like a gate where there was no wall.'

'The idea that fortresses might operate as checks to an invading army, by the fear of the effect of their garrisons upon its rear, may be considered as obsolete. If a hundred thousand men retire before a hundred and twenty thousand, and as the means of checking the enemy, throw fifty thousand into fortresses,—the consequence only is, that even if the enemy leaves fifty thousand to watch them, the inequality of the active forces that remain, instead of being as five to six, will be in the proportion of five to seven, which is worse than before. But the invader *will not* leave fifty thousand. He will contrive that, for instance, thirty thousand, collected into larger bodies than the garrisons of the divided fortresses, shall keep the latter in check, and be ready to fall with a superior force on the first that ventures beyond its walls; and the difference (twenty thousand) he will add to his former superiority in the field, making the final proportion that of five to nine. Fortresses, therefore, considered merely as places of shelter, are not a source of strength to a retreating army in operations on a large scale, but the contrary. But as *keys* to communications, fortresses have a very considerable effect, though less than was anciently attributed to them. A fortress that can stop up a point of passage for a certain period against all opposition, may oblige an invading force to lose time in taking a circuitous route; and several fortresses of the same kind in succession, may cause the loss of time to amount to some weeks—and a week's greater or less delay may determine the fate of a nation. Hence there is a substantial use of fortresses, and there is an imaginary one; and it is the business of statesmen and commanders of armies, to distinguish one from the other.'—"*Subsidiary Observations*" *to Ch. X. of Bentham's Constitutional Code.*

In placing fortresses, therefore, the object would appear to be, to determine what points it is desirable to hold and retain, at the expense involved in the construction of a fortress. And in calculating the importance of holding or taking possession of existing fortresses, the object is to determine what may be the effect of our holding or taking them, upon the movements and communications* of our own army and of the enemy's; or on the other hand, what may be the effect of their being taken or held by the enemy. In offensive operations the points which it is desirable thus to occupy, reduce themselves to—1. Those whose possession will facilitate the present offensive operations; as by giving the command of bridges, defiles, great roads, &c. which we must pass. 2. Those which will prevent the enemy from approaching to disturb our offensive movement, by cutting off the communication with the rear, or otherwise. 3. Those which will impede the enemy in collecting and organizing his own means of defence. 4. Those which in the event of the failure of our operation, will tend to impede the offensive operations of the enemy against ourselves.—In defensive operations they will be the inverse; viz. 1. Those whose possession checks or retards the offensive operations of the enemy; as by giving the command of bridges, defiles, heads of roads, &c. which the enemy must either pass, or go by a longer and more inconvenient way. 2. Those which will enable us to annoy the offensive movement of the enemy; as by moving on his flanks or rear, &c. 3. Those which will secure to us the means of accumulating our means of defence. 4. Those which, in the event of the ultimate failure of the enemy's operation, will enable us to ruin his army most extensively, and to commence offensive operations against his country with most effect. By attending to these circumstances, peaceful citizens may amuse themselves with speculating on what fortresses ought or ought not to be got possession of, in the next advance of the Holy Allies on Paris.

There is another effect of fortresses, which may be called an adventitious or accidental one. And that is, when advantage

---

* "Communication" in a military sense, means the power of freely moving troops and supplies from one point to another.

The clearness of definitions has been improved by the Baron De Jomini in the work of 1830. But the obscurity is still allowed to remain, which arises from using the term "line (or lines) of operations" sometimes for the line or lines on which an army moves to approach or retire from the enemy, and sometimes for the line or lines it occupies by its front or the fronts of the bodies into which it is divided; things for the most part perpendicular to each other, and therefore intrinsically different. (See p. xv. of *Introduction &c.*) The evil arises from the indefinite nature of the word "operations," which means all and everything. The first should be called "lines of movement;" the other "lines of position."

is taken of the proximity of a fortress, to execute some operation with the army, which could not be executed without the co-operation of the fortress. For example, an inferior force may offer battle under the walls of a fortress with advantage. For not only may the fortress be made a point of *appui*, to a flank or otherwise; but in the event of defeat it may prevent the enemy from following up his victory, while it leaves full liberty to profit by success. But no man ever built a fortress, with a view to fight a battle under it; though after it is built, he has a right to make this use of it. Another important secondary use of fortresses, is for forming places of depôt; but still this is secondary, for the end may in general be answered without affecting the primary destination of the fortress. In fact, to be in a good situation for a depôt, a fortress must be upon a great line of communication, and protect it; which is one of the primary intents of fortresses.

From these considerations appear to result the following maxims; 1. In defensive war, to evacuate all fortresses which will not either now or in the re-action which you contemplate, produce any marked effect upon passages and communications, either in your hands or in the enemy's. For to shut up troops in such, is only to increase the enemy's superiority, without any advantage present or in contemplation. And it follows that all fortresses which from their situation are likely to be always in this condition, should be dismantled, and the expense applied elsewhere. 2. In offensive war, to stop for the surrender of no fortress, which is not absolutely a physical obstacle; but to leave a force of observation to keep in check such garrisons as are left behind, keeping this force in a state of greater concentration than the garrisons it watches, in order that it may be able to act decisively before their union, against the first that leave their walls. 3. And further, to organize an army of sieges in the rear, if there are fortresses whose possession by the enemy greatly impedes your offensive exertions, or which in the event of ill-success will afford dangerous facilities for intercepting your retreat, or assuming the offensive against your own territory; provided always, that there is a probability of reducing these fortresses within such a time as will be of use to you. For to undertake an accessory siege of three months, when the success of your operation is to be entirely decided in two, would be throwing force away.

It will be gathered from all these considerations, that the effect of fortresses in the present times is mainly reduced to the degree in which they may promote or impede the execution of the vigorous system of operating against *men*, or as Napoleon expressed it, *masses*, which his practice introduced. From which

it seems to be an inference, that though they will ever continue to be an important instrument of war, *as cannon are*,—it is as vain and feeble an attempt to secure a country against attack by fortresses, as to secure it by drawing a line of cannon round it. Each instrument is good in its use, but not in its abuse. If confirmation were wanted, the two last invasions of France would be in point; in which it was demonstrated, that no chains of fortresses can avail, after the masses which should defend a country have been disorganized.

And here lay the great error of the French people or the rulers they allowed to come over them, in their measures of defence after the attempt at revolution in last July. Everybody knew that France, strong in her positive power, and with three-fourths of the inhabitants in every country in Europe on her side, was in a situation to dictate her own terms, and to command peace as long as she maintained this attitude of moral influence. But nobody except the men of the *juste milieu*, ever believed that France, bankrupt in reputation, and with the curses of three-fourths of the inhabitants of Europe added to the animosity of her natural foes the other fourth, was able behind her fortresses to resist the combined efforts of the continent, joined to her own intestine divisions as they are and as they will be. Such a thing never entered into the head of any but a man of the three per cents; there is not a soldier of the rank of corporal, who does not see which way the thing is tending. The Holy Allies are no fools; and they will not mar their cause by any premature exhibition of ill humour. Their chance is much better of being at Paris, than on the day after Napoleon retired across the Rhine; but they will lose nothing by being in too much haste. They will wait till the millions, who were once for France, have lost all hope of redemption but through her humiliation. Every fresh advance upon her outworks, will, if they have the genius of butchers' journeymen, be accompanied by new assurances of friendly design. They will cross the Rhine, to prove their anxiety for peace. Meantime the friends of the exiled family will unite, and their enemies divide; while to the Frenchmen of the *juste milieu*, every encroachment put up with, will hold out an increased premium on the endurance of such as are to come. And when the fitting time arrives, then of two things one. Either the French people must agree to reduce their government to what the Holy Allies shall approve of;—in which it is of exceeding little importance, whether their masters insist on the restoration of the old branch of the family or not. Or an attempt will be made to maintain the independence of the country, under circumstances vastly more unfavourable than those of 1793, and consequently de-

manding at least an equal portion of the ferocious energy which saved France at that period. This may be a great evil; but whose fault is it, but of those who refused to walk in the path of decent courage and moderately firm and manly policy when the opportunity was before them? If such a position arrives, every officer must be cashiered who is not voted into his place by acclamation of the rank and file. Was it worth while to bring on this conclusion, for the sake of currying favour with the remnant of the emigrants? The three per cents will go to wreck; not from a crude notion of pecuniary profit by it, but from a consciousness of the impolicy of leaving them to weigh against the interests of France. Would it not have been better to allow them to fall ten per cent, and save the rest? There will be universal suffrage, where there is to be universal sacrifice. Could the dynasty of 1830 have tolerated no form of power, that should have rested on a basis a little more popular than the present? The "best of republics," is a despotism of 200,000 electors, with 600,000 places—six for each elector's family of the majority—in the hands of the executive government to bribe them with; modified by the refusal of the soldiers to fire upon the people. Is it the fault of the French nation, if such a government will not answer to repel foreign conquest as well as to bring it on? Five hundred thousand of the French youth must be sent into the field, and replaced by five hundred thousand more. Would it not have been wiser to have taken the ordinary chances of war, in a demonstration with 30,000 men on Italy? But on which of all these points, is wisdom to be got from the three per cents? Soldiers, merchants, and priests, have all in their turns been said to make bad governors; but a government of *rentiers* has proved itself worse than all. The detestable speculation was, that they would buy peace of the Holy Alliance by the sacrifice of those who rose to help them; and that the struggles of such as had already committed themselves, would be long and desperate enough to keep the enemy at bay. A division of cuirassiers saw a handful of lancers throw themselves before the advancing enemy; and thereon the braggarts in brass pulled up to a halt, and left them to their fate, for the chance that the enemy would never reach themselves. Such was the conduct of those who unfortunately had the French army at their disposal. All Europe is leagued together in hope, to see such baseness brought to punishment. There is no Holy Alliance, or we are all Holy Alliance; it is time to drop petty disputes all over the earth, till this affair is brought to a conclusion. The Poles will manage their own affairs; as they have done hitherto. But if they can secure their independence on condition of furnishing

a moderate contingent to the march to Paris, they will serve Europe by closing with the offer. Europe wants freedom; and cannot begin till this account is settled. The blood of France belongs only to France; let her shed it; but by parity of reasoning, the blood of the rest of Europe belongs only to itself. The interest of all the liberals in Europe is at this moment; to forward the forces of the Holy Alliance to the French frontiers. Let no man be foolish enough to try to act for France; he will be hanged like Menotti. It is a totally rotten and hopeless cause, to attempt assisting a nation, whose government is administered in the interest of the adversary; which carefully preserves the enemies of the common weal, in all offices civil, military, and ecclesiastical; which negotiates with foreign despots through the chosen organs of their old representatives in the Tuileries; and attempts to fire on nobody, but those who parade the flag called national, with more zeal than suits the dull fraud it is desired to carry on.

But the object most immediately connected with the subject is to impress on all concerned, that there will be no military possibility of defending France, if the Holy Allies exert only moderate caution, forecast, and resolution; with the single exception of the apparition of a government closely resembling in energy that of 1793. Those who think this an evil, have only to thank, in the first place, the dynasty of 1830, and in the second, the weakness which ever placed it in its seat. The central position of France was a superb one, for a government which did not act in concert with the enemy. But then, to take advantage of it, implied energy, unity of design, and singleness of purpose. The sword of Scanderbeg was not to be handled by men, whose first idea on coming into possession, was to sell it to the enemy for personal safety and a collusive peace. Europe laughs at the idea of the defence which France is to make under the bankers of the Bourse; after they have shown their civil talents by keeping the royalists in office in the departments, and their military ones by abandoning Belgium, Switzerland, and Italy, and *fortifying Paris*. A chief of the French nation was once pleased to call the people of England "shopkeepers." Shopkeepers they might be; but those shopkeepers did not carry on their wars by intrenching Walworth. It may suit some London citizens to applaud the plan for the defence of France; but they never would have tolerated it, if the case had been their own.

It is therefore only a debt to justice and the rational independence of nations, to protest and insist, in season or out of season, on the marked and palpable truth, that if the French people on the further movements of the continental sovereigns

adopt the regime of 1793, it will have been the simple and necessary consequence of the gross misconduct of the government to which in an hour of miscalled moderation they unhappily entrusted their affairs;—a government which had the most splendid opportunity perhaps ever presented in history, of raising a nation to the pinnacle of reputation and esteem, and securing peace by an honourable readiness for war, and which threw it all away, by a series of cold-blooded frauds and studied insults on the national feeling that had raised it into power, which like the other, is perhaps unparalleled in its kind.

There appears to be a combination for the press to keep this down. The three-per-cents are in all printing offices; and the men of the *juste milieu* seem as if they commanded all the types in Europe. What for instance can be more imperfect than the statements of some of the liberal press in England, on the base affair of Italy? What can be farther from an accurate exhibition of the facts, than to represent the question as having been, whether France should go to war *for the purpose of supporting a people struggling with their government*,—when the evident, palpable contest was, whether France should go to war for the purpose of *preventing the interference of foreigners* with a people struggling with their government,—an object which the French nation, in its actual circumstances, had as direct an interest in supporting, as it is possible to conceive in any case where the danger is not immediately personal? It is true we have the letters of O P Q. But brilliance in one quarter, cannot destroy the existence of darkness in another.

It is a melancholy fact, but there are few men, except the Tories, who can see a league beyond their noses; and *they* can snuff an injury to the general concern, from hence to Tartary. There have been moments, when the interests of the multitudes which compose the aggregate of nations, have found defenders of transcendent energy and talent; but when half the clear-sightedness and vigour habitually displayed by their enemies, can be permanently produced on their own side—then, and not before, may the popular cause throughout Europe be expected to succeed. At this moment, through the treachery of the men of the *juste milieu* in France, a disastrous eclipse appears to be before it; but eclipses are but for a season, and the interest of mankind is, that the consequences of this one shall be such, as shall prevent the repetition of the meanness in which it had its origin.

The event which will be sure to cause the explosion of the fraud which has been practised on the friends of liberty in France, will be any marked misfortune to the Polish cause. The Poles are clearly the inheritors of the mantle of Napoleon;

but with the odds that are against them, they still may fail. If this should happen, there must perforce be a republic of 1793 in France, though it may chance to be too late. For to expect a nation to act, under a government which sends regiments to Algiers for refusing to fire on the people, would be drivelling. Those, therefore, in all countries, who wish for a republic of 1793, have only to resist assistance to the Poles.

It would be unjust to the Whig Ministers to end without noticing the contrast between the results of different lines of conduct in France and England. If they had tried to dupe the English nation by frittering away their promises of reform, they would have been by this time in the situation of the French government, and the monarchy itself might not have been in much more hopeful plight. If the French ministers had gone honestly to work in the spirit which all the engagements under which they undertook the charge demanded of them, they would have been where the English ministers are now, and Louis Philippe on one side of the water, would have been as William the Fourth upon the other.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 July, 1831.

ART. XVIII.—1. *A Letter on the Belgic Revolution; its Origin, Causes, and Consequences.*—London. T. C. Hansard. 1831.

2.—*Rapport du Ministre des Affaires Etrangères, à M. le Régent de la Belgique, sur la Situation de nos Relations Extérieures, au 15 mars* 1831. *Suivi de Pièces Justificatives.* Publié par ordre du Congrès.—Bruxelles. 1831.

"A PAMPHLET has just been published on the Belgic "revolution, entitled *A Letter on the Belgic Revolution—* "*its Origin, Causes, and Consequences.* This little produc- "tion, which is a tissue of lies and libels on the Dutch Govern- "ment from beginning to end, pretends to be written by an "Englishman, long resident in the country. We should be "sorry to think that any Englishman should show so little regard "to truth, and should take such undue advantages of the gulli- "bility of his countrymen. The author uses more than the "privilege of 'a traveller'—he uses that of an inventor of ca- "lumnies*."

When a statement of this precise form and nature, appears in defence of an injured sovereign, who has been driven from the capital he tried to burn, it is evidence to all experienced persons, that there must be much good in the publication which

* Times 23 June, 1831.

is its object. The pamphlet thus described, is in fact a recapitulation of the various urgent sufferings which drove the Belgian people into resistance; and which, though there will always be a difference of opinion on the amount of evil between the oppressor and the oppressed, between the scourger and the scourged, have their existence established by irrefragable history, to say nothing of the general argument derivable from the energy of the reaction. Is it true or false, for instance, that when the Constitution of what was called the Kingdom of the Netherlands was proposed to the Belgian Notables, there voted *for* accepting it 527, *against* it 796;—on which the King, now ejected, declared that there were 280 members absent, who it was reasonable to suppose intended thereby to vote for the Constitution, and that 126 declared their vote *against* to be induced by articles referring to religious matters, which the said King did not opine to be a proper cause;—whereon he declared that there could "be no doubt of the sentiments and wishes of the great majority of our subjects," and there was declared to be a majority accordingly? This one act, deserving to be ranked for its contempt of popular rights with his who made a consul of his horse, would of itself justify any resistance that should be made with reasonable prospects of success. The words in which it was done, may be found in the original, with a translation, in p. 162 of the Westminster Review for January of the present year. Is it true, that under Napoleon the Belgians had trial by jury, and that the King deprived them of it? Is it true that he abolished the publicity of the examination of witnesses? These were the results which that greatest of all curses, the success of the Holy Allies, brought to the Belgians. Is it true that the King assumed an arbitrary power over the education of the kingdom; founded on an article of the Constitution which said, that "public instruction should be a constant object of the attention of the government"? Is it true that the language of the Belgians or of the most considerable portion of them, was prohibited in public documents; that it was decreed that their lawyers should plead in a foreign tongue, and even an unhappy Belgian should make his will in Dutch? Is it true that the King declared the Constitution to be an act of his particular grace, which he might modify at pleasure? Is it true that it was regulated that two millions of Dutch should return as many Deputies to the States General, as four millions of Belgians? And finally is it true, that while the Belgian Deputies were at the Hague, at the Chamber of the States convoked on pretence of treating on the separation of the two countries, an army under the King's son marched upon Brussells? If these things are true, then the "Letter on the Belgic Revo-

lution" is a faithful document, and another addition to the mass of proof, how much it behoves all communities to retain the charge of their own keeping in their own proper hands.

But another point of great importance at the present moment, is to trace the progress of those Holy Alliance operations against the Belgians, in which our present ministers are by succession unhappily involved. Their situation was a difficult one; and it would have been unfair to expect of them too much. It would be charitable to suppose too, that since they began, they have arrived at an increased familiarity with the utility of justice. They have always the power to retreat; and it is even now rumoured, that they are on the point of declaring their withdrawal from a scene of disgraceful imposition, of which they certainly are not chargeable with the commencement. A reforming aristocracy has a claim to indulgence for its 'prentice hand; and the declaration of Lord Grey on the subject of a republic in Belgium*, leaves much to expectation. He may have discovered by the same processes, that in the changes impending over the continent, he has the power of making the whole a source of advantage to his country; that a *just* monarchy has no more to fear from republics in one place than in another, in France than in America, in Belgium than in Switzerland; that if unjust attack has made republics conquerors, friendly cordiality would direct them in the track of the general good. The declaration of the English minister has sheathed the arms of millions upon the continent, and doubled the chances for the preservation of his country's peace.

But the Belgian affair still remains. And if ever there was an amusing instance of the way in which the snake-like thing entitled diplomacy proceeds in its tortuous purposes, it is the present. It is merry to see a little attorney spreading his toils about some innocent upon the stage; to guess at each step, what may possibly be the next; to exhaust ingenuity in surmising, how words may be made to bear the contrary of their meaning; though much of the pleasure arises, after all, from the expectation of dramatic justice in the end. But it is merrier still to see a collection of statesmen operating with the same end; and not less pleasant to calculate on an explosion in their disfavour, of magnitude proportioned to the general scale. One point such statesmen overlook;—how all these things go to create that general aversion to existing power,—that profound suspicion, or more properly no suspicion, of the agents of established governments,—that deep conviction of there being no necessity in the nature of things why such prin-

* 24 June, 1831.

ciples should be maintained in the dominion of mankind,—which are each and severally ingredients of the urgent desire of change, that everywhere agitates the world.

The first "Protocol" of the conference held by the plenipotentiaries of Austria, France, Great Britain, Prussia, and Russia, is dated on the 4th Nov. 1830, about a month after the repulse of the Dutch from Brussells and the establishment of a Provisional Government in Belgium. It states a "lively desire" to put a stop to disorder and the effusion of blood, and proposes an armistice on the following conditions, (but which are "to be "of no prejudice to the questions of which the five courts may "hereafter have to facilitate the settling;")—

—'that on both sides hostilities shall cease. The respective troops shall be bound to retire mutually behind the line which before the date of the Treaty of 30 May, 1814, separated the possessions of the sovereign prince of the United Provinces, from those which have been joined to his territory to form the Kingdom of the Netherlands by the said Treaty of Paris, and by the Treaties of Vienna and Paris of the year 1815.'—*Protocol* 4 *Nov.* 1830.

—and this statement of limits is found worded over again in the Protocol of the 17th of the same month, where they are stated to be

'The limits which separated Belgium from the United Provinces of the Pays-Bas antecedently to the Treaty of Paris of 30 May, 1814.'

Now can any man tell, what was the line which separated Belgium from the United Provinces of the Pays-Bas *before* the date of the treaty of 30 May 1814 (which was the treaty that broke up the empire of Napoleon)? Can all history inform us, or any light be thrown on that obscure and almost antediluvian fact, the boundaries of Belgium *before* the notable treaty of 30 May 1814? And above all, can any man guess, how many plans of chicane, dispute, and circumvention, lay under this apparently simple proposal?

The offer, if it was what words mean, was manifestly a very liberal one for the Belgians. It was conceding to their present possession all the territories they could possibly claim; and therefore it was natural that they should pay attention to it. The Holy Alliance knew it would not be easy to win the confidence of the Belgians; and they increased their bait accordingly. The Belgians however acted with considerable caution. They said they would give orders for the cessation of hostilities, and for withdrawing their troops to their side of the line which separated Belgium from the United Provinces before the 30th May 1814; but added in immediate sequence—

On this occasion the Provisional Government of Belgium owes it to good faith to remark, that it understands by this line the limits which, conformably to the Second Article of the fundamental law of the Pays-Bas, separated the northern from the southern provinces of the country, including the whole left bank of the Scheldt.'—*Answer of the Provisional Government*, 10 *Nov.* 1830.

If then anybody maintained, that the line thus for precaution's sake described by the Belgian government, was not the line proposed, here was a clear refusal. No two peasants of honest intentions, could by any possibility get up a dispute on a similar case. But what says the Holy Alliance? It replies (by Protocol of 17 Nov. 1830) that

'The plenipotentiaries have decided that the answer should be received, because, on one side, it contains an entire acceptance of the bases laid down by the conference of London for a cessation of hostilities, and, because, on the other, the passage in this same answer which begins with the words "*On this occasion,*" and ends with the words "*including the whole left bank of the Scheldt,*" expresses, as is observed in the report of Messrs Cartwright and Bresson, nothing but an opinion entirely subordinate to the full and unreserved acceptance which goes before.'

Now mark the resemblance to the dispute about the black and white horses. "I agree," signs one of the suitors, "to accept of the proposed division of my father's property, which assigns to me among other things his black and white horses; always declaring that I mean thereby, all his black horses, and all his white, and all that are black and white mingled." Whereupon says the pretended arbiter, "We have got your agreement in writing; and the passage in which you define what it is you agree to, is only *an opinion.*" This is diplomacy; this is that base and brazen idol, before which men are invited to lie down, and of which the people of England are to bear the risks and the expenses. Or to put a briefer case,—A man writes, "I agree to take ten pounds sterling." "Sir," says his opponent, "you have agreed in writing to take ten pounds; and the word *sterling* is nothing but an opinion. It is for our side to determine whether the pounds shall be sterling or Scots." No such frauds as these could hold together for an hour, if they were practised in the common concerns of men, and published in a language which the public is in the habit of understanding.

In the same Protocol of 17 November 1830, the Congress of London directed its agents to announce to the Belgians, that the armistice having been agreed to by both the contending parties, "constituted an engagement entered into towards the five powers." Here then is manifestly the Holy-Alliance foot. "An engagement"—what engagement? Do men make engage-

ments without knowing it? Or is somebody born with a right divine to make engagements for them? Men must be cautious; lest they should go to bed free, and wake with an engagement. The Belgians therefore on the 23rd November sent a "*Note verbale*" to the negotiators at Brussells, asking if they could be informed what engagement they had entered into with the five powers, and stating that "the Provisional "Government had never considered the interference of the pow- "ers as anything but a friendly proceeding of mediators ani- "mated by a desire of concord and peace, who offer their good "offices to the belligerent parties, and try to conciliate their "differences, with the agreement and free consent of their allies "or neighbours engaged in a war;" but protesting that to their knowledge and belief, they had never entered into any engagement towards the powers at all.

The Holy alliance replies through its agents (*Note verbale* of 6 Dec. 1830) that the Belgian Government perfectly understood the nature of the proceeding of the powers when it described it as the "friendly proceeding of mediators animated by a desire of concord and peace;" and adds, that

'It is precisely because such is the spirit of their proceeding, and in order that its effect may be sure and beyond all danger, that the five powers have *judged it useful to render the armistice unlimited, and to consider it as an engagement undertaken towards themselves, and to the execution of which it is their business henceforth to look.*'

Here the tyranny and fraud begin distinctly to break out. The armistice is not to be what the makers made it, but what the Holy Alliance chuse to make it. The engagements of the Belgians with the oppressor powers, are not to be what the Belgians ever undertook, but what the Holy Allies, sitting by their plenipotentiaries in our Foreign Office, chuse to *consider as undertaken.* The whole earth never contained anything more rootedly dishonest, or more discreditable to Englishmen for the portion of it in which they have been involved.

On the 27th and 28th of November 1830, the Belgian diplomatic committee forwarded notes claiming Limbourg and the left bank of the Scheldt, and Maestricht, as within the line assigned to themselves by agreement. And here breaks out the meditated fraud, which no living man could have guessed at without the aid of the initiated. It was, that the limits between Belgium and the United Provinces before the treaty of Paris, were to be settled by what the Holy Alliance at some subsequent period might have been pleased to determine *ought to have* belonged to Holland. If the Holy Allies of London meant so, why did not they say so? If they intended to wrong

the Belgians, why did not they do it openly; it is always genteeler to rob than to swindle. If they meant 1790, why did they name 1814? They purposely held out a tempting offer, knowing that they had a fraudulent construction behind; with the object, not so much of defrauding the Belgians in the matter of the limits, as of worming them into the pretence of an engagement towards the Holy Alliance, which should give a power over them for ulterior purposes. Luxembourg came under precisely the same terms. At the period immediately antecedent to the 30th May 1814, it was manifestly not part of the United Provinces, and had none of the relations subsequently existing with Germany. It was also, with the exception of its fortress, in full possession of the Belgians by the spontaneous junction of its people.

On the 14th December 1830, the Whig ministers for the first time make their appearance on the scene. A note of that date conveys information of the interference of the powers to induce the King of Holland to perform his part of the armistice by opening the Scheldt; an act of justice, and an honourable beginning for new performers. The Belgians appear to have been so wrought on by it, that on the next day the Provisional Government declared its agreement in the Protocol of the 17th November 1830, but always with a reservation that "the "ulterior questions of policy or territory to be definitively "settled between Belgium and Holland were in no way to be "affected by it."

Here ends what may be called the first act of the Belgian drama, and begins the second. On the 20th December appeared a new Protocol from the plenipotentiaries at the Foreign Office. The Conference herein say, that having received the agreement of both parties to the armistice, they shall now begin to "discuss and concert the new arrangements best "calculated to unite the future independence of Belgium, with "the stipulations of treaties, with the interests and security of "other powers, and with the preservation of the equilibrium "of Europe." Who asked them to do all this? Europe hoped it had got rid of the Holy Alliance; and it finds it sitting in Downing-Street. Not a word of what the Belgians will consent to, or will not; they are invited "to send commis-"sioners to London as quickly as possible," but it is only for the sake of "being consulted and heard on all points that may "facilitate the definitive adoption of the arrangements *of which* "*mention has been made above.*"

Let it be supposed for a moment, that Englishmen were treated with a mixture of insolence, folly, and injustice, like what is exemplified here. The inference is brief. The Holy

Alliance is not put down, and must be. Everything is an English interest—that is, the interest of Englishmen,—which tends to confound, disgrace, and defeat that huge system of invasion upon justice in the abstract. There must come a time when the affairs of nations shall be settled by themselves, and not by the representatives of a few foreign families in conference assembled. For this object it is that all men sigh; for this it is, that all over the world they are of one brotherhood and one sect. The end cannot be far.

On some occasions, the notes presented by the Belgian negotiators were sent back again. It is not quite clear whether this was meant for insolence or folly; but it is evident that the opinion of those who did it, was, that to conduct a negotiation it is not necessary to know what the parties say.

On the 4th January 1831, the Belgian commissioners who had arrived in London in consequence of the demand in the Protocol, addressed a note to the conference, to state that they could not proceed to treat any of the points at issue between the parties at war, till the Dutch had fulfilled the condition, which had never yet been done, of opening the Scheldt. And they addressed another on the 6th, communicating the ideas of the Belgian Government on the subject of the limits; and these limits were the same that they had agreed to for the armistice.

On the 9th January 1831, another Protocol was dispatched to Brussells, requiring the King of Holland to open the Scheldt by the 20th January, and the Belgians to raise the blockade of Maestricht; concluding with the declaration that the five powers will not allow the renewal of hostilities in any case, and that "they have taken the immoveable determination to obtain "the completion of the decisions, which are dictated to them "by justice and the desire to maintain the general peace." The Belgian Congress received this on the 17th, and determined that if the Scheldt was opened, the Belgian troops should give up the blockade of Maestricht; but they protested in strong terms against the declaration with which the Protocol was wound up.

On the 20th January 1831, came forth from the Foreign Office the Protocol pretending to determine the limits between Holland and Belgium. The limits assigned to Belgium *were those of* 1790. In this manner the left bank of the Scheldt, which, together with Limbourg had been ceded by Holland in 1795 and subsequent periods *in return for portions of ancient Belgium* which Holland still possesses, was to be taken away, in order that the Dutch might possess a safe passage into Belgium, and be able to drown it by opening the sluices. It was

the old Holy-Alliance principle of giving one man possession of another's back-door, in order to enable him to rob the house at will. It was the same thing as if the Holy Alliance had given France the coast of Hampshire or Sussex. Something was intimated about exchanges to be made hereafter by the friendly care of the five courts; but it was evident that what they did not do then, their intention was to do never. Belgium, moreover, was to be perpetually neuter. That is, it was to give up the idea of being an independent nation, and exist as the pet farm of the Holy Allied powers.

On the 1st February 1831, the National Congress protested against all and every part of the Protocol, and all claims or obligation which could in any manner be raised against Belgium unless previously accepted by the National Representation. A spirited and honest protest, such as all men are in the habit of admiring whether from friend or enemy, and adding a hearty interest in the ultimate defeat of the injustice which brought on the necessity.

This is the odious business into which the ministry, which after all must be called the Reform ministry, has contrived to plunge itself. It is for such ends, that England is threatened with the ills of war. While Englishmen are seeking for Reform, the Holy Alliance is sitting in their capital. But the Belgians will know better than to yield. They will take their own way, like brave and honest men, and rest assured the people of England are not of the plot that they complain of.

The points for the reader to observe are, that the Belgians have made no engagement, that they have all along protested that they made no engagement, and that the attempt to say they have made any, or to saddle them with the consequences, is an act of direct fraud, and an imposition in the style of the rest of the proceedings of that unrighteous combination, which Europe shortly will put down.

Programme to the Westminster Review for 1 Oct. 1831.

THE question of Reform or Revolution, is rapidly approaching its solution in Great Britain. The honest part of the Radicals have done their duty in endeavouring to promote the first; and are quite ready to take their parts in the other, whenever it shall please the powers that be, to turn over that leaf in the nation's history. It is loudly affirmed that the Lords intend to reject the Bill; and therefore every man has a week or ten days to consider what he will do next.

The European Revolution is postponed, till the Russians

shall have retired from Paris. Warsaw has fallen; and a large majority of the French Chamber has decided that the Russians may move on. A corps of the French army has made a *reconnaissance* in Belgium; and having ascertained that Holland was occupied by an advanced guard of the Holy Alliance, it retired according to its orders. At the date of the last despatches, order reigned in Paris.

Belgium has had an escape from being an independent republic. What it is now, is not so easy to define; but it is certain that it has escaped. One of the moderate Whig papers, hopes the Westminster Review will acquiesce in Belgian happiness.

The Americans are successfully planting free negroes on the coast of Africa; a greater event possibly in its consequences, than any that has occurred since Columbus set sail for the New World. At the same time it is clear that England may claim some share in the renown; for the warnings of all kinds she has given at great expense in her colonial policy.

The Tories threaten a reaction; and the Cholera continues to advance. Endeavour has been made to provide a cataplasm, according to the circumstances of the case. It is plain that heavy times are coming; and he is the wisest man, that shall be found the best prepared.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 October, 1831.

ART. XIII.—*The Quarterly Journal of Education.* No. I, II, III, and IV.—London. C. Knight. 1831.

WHEN arts and sciences of all kinds have their appropriate journals, it was fitting there should be one for Education which is the vivifying power of them all. Time was, when knowledge was cooped up with the few; and those who possessed it, had the reputation of been conjurors. A priest could neither be disputed with nor punished; for he was the only man that could read and write, and by consequence much too good to be hanged. The aristocracy said their prayers without book; but they had a monopoly of the mystery of case-armour, which served them excellently in the place of other information. It was then that privilege was safe; and jacobinism, under other names, is traceable to the time when the herd of human kind began to find out, that they had not only hands to execute, but heads to learn and understandings to conceive. In reality it is the spread of knowledge, to a vastly greater extent than the existence of knowledge, which is the crying symptom of the present times. The recipe for gunpowder might have long

lurked in the papers of a studious monk; but it is when every man knows how to handle a harquebuse behind a barricade, that the effects of the discovery present themselves to view. Consequences of the same kind present themselves in all directions; and if knowledge be power, all diffusion of knowledge must be diffusion of power.

It is pleasant, therefore, to see the dispensers of education exerting themselves, not only in the dispersion of knowledge in the gross, but in the encouragement of that particular spirit, or, as it may be called, *taste* in knowledge, which is best calculated to produce marked effects in the circumstances of the times. Come what may of the Reform Bill, let learning if possible be made radical. That is, let it in all practicable cases be based upon that ruthless exercise of close reasoning, that habitual suspicion of antiquated forms, that acute and practical perception of what is common sense and what is not, and that incessant encouragement of the faculty of rightly connecting causes with their effects, which are the foundation of what in politics is called radicalism, and in science, philosophy. The battle of freedom may be fought in the House of Commons; but it also may be fought in the school and in the lecture-room, without the slightest wandering from scientific subjects. It is, therefore, no light or inconsiderable office which the professor of education may perform; and with less of enthusiasm than led the calvinistic poet to ascribe the arrival of seed-time and harvest to the prayers of his solitary saint, the care-worn and patient teacher may consider himself as laying the foundation of future forms of human society, and with noiseless operation working change upon the habitable globe. Besides the general complaint that knowledge is lacking, another which may be made with equal justice is, that much of what men think they know, is wrong. If proof be asked, it is sufficient to point to the gross fallacies, the flagrant absurdities, which are daily advanced and recklessly defended, by men above the medium or average degree of opportunity for information, by legislators, statesmen, and divines. All these prove, that there is an intense dearth of acquaintance, not only with what *is* truth, but with what *is not*. The very sources and channels of knowledge want purifying. Muddy geometry and muddier Latin, are poured into our infant souls, and we are taught to reverence them as what the world has of most brilliant and most clear. Education, till the late shaking which has taken place among its dry bones, was little more than an exercise of unreason, a preparation of recipients for any falsehood and any folly which it might be the interest of the directors to introduce. It was always to be a machine wrought for a particular end; and that end was never

the enabling men to form judgments for themselves. On the contrary, there was always to be a result; and the result was to be a creed, an opinion. The problem was to add together quantities so that the conclusion should be of an assigned amount, not to ascertain what was the real amount. For these reasons it is, that intelligent men will hail the appearance of a journal which treats of education in a manner befitting the near completion of the first third of the nineteenth century. Not but there is in it matter which may alarm the timid, and give some handle to the supporters of ancient abuses; as for example when it is stated without disguise, that in the department dignified by the title of *Propria quæ maribus*, "a complete revolution is requisite." But if the charge is made out, and a revolution is really necessary, it only remains to hold out rewards to those who shall accomplish it most speedily, and best.

As might be expected, a great portion of the revolutionary spirit is let loose upon those branches of science, which, in respect of their actual condition, have by a ridiculous misnomer been entitled the *exact*. Without maintaining the perfection of the details—for how should details be perfect, in an early effort to stir up the mud of two thousand years—the Articles on "Professor De Morgan's Elements of Arithmetic" in No. I, on "Mathematical Instruction" in No. II, and on "Lessons on Number" in No. III, are evidence that in the sciences misnamed the exact, men are beginning to require a reason for the faith that is in them. And this, not from the expectation of arriving at different ultimate results; because those results are so checked and sifted in the daily course of human affairs, that the reasoning might be of tenfold its present badness, without the possibility of being wrong in the ultimate belief that the square on the hypotenuse is equal to the sums of the squares on the other sides. Not, therefore, from a surmise that mankind will ever be proved to have been in error in its adherence to this and other propositions; but from a strong persuasion that the method will be discovered to have been naught, by which these true propositions were pretended to be established in the minds of learners. If a book of geometry were printed, in which the head of every proposition was preserved, but carefully attached to the wrong demonstration,—or if instead of demonstrations were attached extracts totally irrelevant, as for instance from a sermon or a newspaper—this might give an idea of what some persons find it so difficult to comprehend, the possibility of a book of science being absolutely right in its results, and absolutely worthless in all that pertains to the mode of reasoning by which such results are undertaken to be established. What by the constitution of things is true, can by no error

in argument be made false; but the question still remains, of whether the truth has been demonstrated by argument or not.

The improvement hinted at as attainable in the details, may be reduced to the carrying still further the spirit of examination of first principles. If "mathematical demonstration has acquired the name of certain, on account of the simplicity and perfect admissibility of the principles assumed,"—why not acquire for it the name of *more certain*, by refusing to admit any principles upon assumption at all? Why not state roundly, that nothing is self-evident but an identical proposition; and that all other pretended self-evidences, are laziness or want of skill? The first lesson mathematics have to teach, is to show men what it is they *do not* know.* Their very earliest practical use is, to call into existence and to sharpen the faculty of distinguishing between what is only surmised to be true, and what can be demonstrated. In the college from which the writer of this derived whatever he may have to write, there still lives the memory of a freshman, who protested against the whole of Euclid as being what he knew "*by intuition.*" This individual laboured under a high degree of indistinctness upon the point above described. Why, then, not improve to the utmost in pushing the distinction? It might be proper enough that the inventors of mathematical science, who lived in ages when the knowledge of the square of the hypotenuse was a thing to be paid for by a hecatomb, should push on to further results without waiting for the removal of all obscurities in the foundations or practice of their art. It would have been an awful thing if Euclid and his successors had determined to bury their light for a modicum of generations, because they had not satisfactorily exhausted the theory of parallels. But all this forms no cause why the existing race of mankind should not enjoy the luxury of sound argument where it can be had. The old world wanted facts; the present, reason. It is valuable to know that the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles; without it there can neither be good carpenters, nor sailors, nor engineers. But it is also highly valuable, to those who are neither to be carpenters, nor sailors, nor engineers, that they should be trained in the exercise of the most scrupulous reasoning that can be had, on a proposition where there is no doubt of the ultimate truth, and no contrariety of interests to distract. Cudworth has suggested, that even geometrical theorems,—that the three angles of a triangle, for instance, are equal to two right angles,—if connected with offensive moral truths, might possibly become the subject of doubt and controversy. He would probably have been more near the truth by saying, that if the manner of the proof had been connected with men's coarse and

tangible interests, it would long ago have been made the subject of most earnest doubt and controversy. And the first point in dispute would have been the admission of what are called self-evident truths. There are some who in first principles love obscurity and faith; there are others who love them not, and who had rather walk ten mile afoot to see a good argument, than step over their threshold to see a good assumption. It will be said in answer, that the things assumed are plain. All things are plain; to those who think them so. The monarchical principle is plain, legitimacy is plain, ecclesiastical supremacy is plain. The great lesson of all, is to believe none of these plainnesses; to trust nothing for its looks; to jump at nothing; to swallow nothing; to admit nothing into the mental stomach, that has not been submitted to the most rigid examination; in short, to pass all things through the sieve of demonstration, without being disturbed by the assertion, that there are some that need not such a trial.

In other departments of mathematical instruction, the scarcity of reasoning is in general equally apparent. Algebra, with most that pursue it, is a jingle of symbols, signifying nothing. The doctrine of functions, as stated and applied, is an attempt at a building where the foundation shall be suspended to the superstructure. The fluxional or differential calculus is with most men an operation of the black art, more nearly than a process of reasoning. Sound is perpetually received in the place of sense, and words for meaning. Men of powerful minds have struck out the paths to knowledge, by a procedure comparable to that by which some persons can collect the contents of a book by glancing down the page; but it has not been vulgarly found out, that the way to follow these, is to begin by learning humbly to spell. The result is coveted, but not the means; and the consequence is that the name of mathematician is more apt to excite the idea of an adept in the management of a particular kind of cups and balls, than of one practised in tracing the connexion between causes and effects by the energies of cultivated reason. Hence too it is that those who are from time to time dismissed from the professed seats of mathematical learning, are so unapt for the application of sound argument to the concerns of common life, so poor in political economy, so rash and feeble in everything which has not the management of algebraic notation for its basis. They have been trained to take the rhythm of reasoning for reason. They labour under a diarrhœa of conclusions; and are unable to imagine how anything which they have framed into a syllogistic form can be untrue. They come into the world like sheep among wolves; with a total ignorance of the quantity of error that is in it, and a perfect absence of the

habit of suspecting fallacy under the garb of ratiocination. Their trade has been to learn, and not to examine; which makes the worst possible qualification, either to discover or to teach.

The Journal of Education holds forth a prospect of the end of much of this evil. Reform is manifestly afoot and doing, in those most venerable fabrics which Cudworth thought to be exempt from the mutations of human things. The spirit is noble, and promises a new æra, if not in the direct results of mathematical investigation, at all events in those indirect ones which consist in the improvement of the powers of reasoning by the process. And it is impossible that this improvement should not of itself generate progression, both in mathematical science, and those other sciences of every-day use to which the practice of reasoning is the handmaid. The field is vast, and those who feel themselves moved to the exertion should divide the ground. All that they require for their task is perseverance, order, and an incessant consciousness that improvement is progressive, and implies a readiness to sacrifice what was thought perfect yesterday, to whatever may be shown to be better tomorrow.

It is in the way of a contribution in this spirit, that observations will be offered on some parts which to a fresh eye may seem to be susceptible of improvement. For example, in the following passage, an abuse of indefinite antiquity is exposed with excellent effect; but addition might usefully be made to the remedies proposed.

'In the application of algebraical symbols to geometry, misconceptions usually prevail, which are countenanced by the looseness of expression of many elementary works. They are mostly founded upon the analogy existing between the algebraical expression $a \times a$, or a^2, called a square, and the geometrical square described upon the line which contains a units. Against this confusion of terms the teacher must be on his guard, and should carefully avoid that symbolical notation recommended in some books, by which AB^2 is made to stand for the square described on AB. If a short symbol for this be used it might be $\overline{|AB|}$, and the necessity of proving that the number of $\overline{|1|}$ is contained in $\overline{|a|}$ is $a \times a$, would not be concealed under a *petitio principii*.'—No II. *p.* 276.

The concluding part of this is so obscure, that though there can be no absolute doubt of the general meaning, it may lead to the suspicion of errors in the press But setting this aside, would not the grand practical remedy for the evil complained of, be to insist on the symbols a^2 and a^3 being expressed by the sounds or phrases *a to the second power*, and *a to the third*

power, as is done with their cousins-german a^4 and a^5? And in all this it should be noted, that there is no war against the existence of the analogy, and no war against any practised mathematician's employing the symbol a^2 to express the content of a square whose side is a, any more than against employing the symbol 9 to express the content of a square whose side is 3; but that there is open war against confounding in the mind of a learner, what is only analogy, with what is identical in the constitution of things. The summary fact is, that the algebraists have intruded themselves into quarters where there is no more justice in their inteference, than there would be in an adjutant-general's pretending that he made the troops by his operations with the returns. He may be most useful in writing down and comparing what *is;* but he cannot make the primary facts, which are the battalions; the fact of there being the battalions, must arise from other sources. So all the algebraists in the world cannot create the fact that the square on the hypotenuse is equal to the squares on the other sides; they can only make useful observations on the fact when it is known. Hence in the whole progress through as much of geometry as may be represented by the Books of Euclid, it would be highly advantageous to abstain rigorously from any introduction of algebraic notation, till the learner is firmly impressed with the geometrical truths concerned; and *then* introduce the algebraic notation as a convenient abbreviation. There is no denying that the ordinary way in which students proceed, is to learn a little by geometry and a little by algebra, in a manner that resembles the association of fragments from different chains, with no union between the parts. Very few thoroughly understand Euclid's mode of demonstrating that spheres are in the triplicate ratio of their diameters; *or any other.* Equally few know clearly what a triplicate ratio means; the general belief being, that it is something like *a cube.* At the beginning of the present century, the tradition ran in Cambridge that *two* *men in the university understood the Fifth Book of Euclid; and yet what is aimed at and shadowed out in that Fifth Book, is indispensable to prove so simple a fact as that the diagonals of two squares are in the same proportion as the sides. Not that the Fifth Book is either "exact" or "intelligible;" notwithstanding the praise which Barrow and Simson have been pleased to heap upon it†. On the contrary it would be a melancholy monument of human imperfection, if all human

* Barnes, *Regin.* Lothian, *Trin.*

† "The 5th Book being thus corrected, I most readily agree to what the learned Dr. Barrow says. "That there is nothing in the whole body of the elements of a more subtile invention, nothing more solidly established, and more accurately handled than the doctrine of proportionals."—*Simson's Euclid; Notes to Book* V.

works were not necessarily progressive ; and it stands a discrédit and a disgrace to the energies of the moderns, who with their improved advantages have never had sufficient sense of the accurate and the true, to put a finishing hand to what, after all, was a vigorous though not conclusively successful effort on the part of their predecessors of antiquity.

The intimation [*p.* 270] that $-a$, $\sqrt{-a}$, $\frac{a}{0}$, $\frac{0}{0}$, are symbols "contradictory and absurd in their nature," is one which lies open to much discussion. The question with respect to these symbols must clearly be, whether the user can define what they mean ; and if he can, they are neither contradictory nor absurd. With respect to the first, there seems to be no denying, that a man may lawfully have an account of credits and an account of debts, and if he pleases may distinguish the first by the mark + and the other by the mark —. In such a case it is plain that — 20*l.* means nothing but 20*l.* with a provision that it is subtractive. And if the debts should turn out to be 50*l.*, while all the assets producible are only 30*l.*, will any person aver that there is any doubt of what is meant by saying the man is *minus* 20*l.*, or 20*l.* worse than nothing? It is true that these twenty pounds of debt can neither be touched nor handled nor seen nor felt ; his creditors are aware of it to their grief. But does any person maintain that therefore it is irrational, unmeaning, contradictory, or absurd, to describe the culprit as *minus* 20*l.*? And when the algebraist speaks of multiplying by a negative quantity, as for instance by — 2, what he means is, that if a debtor and creditor account is the subject of the multiplication, the amount of all the credits shall be doubled and inserted in the list of debts, and the amount of debts doubled and inserted in the credits. For example, if for some reason it were desirable to multiply a debtor and creditor account by $6-2$, which ought to be the same as multiplying it by 4 ; after the debts and credits have been each multiplied by 6, it is plain that the result must be brought out by adding twice the credits to the list of debts, and twice the debts to the list of credits, and that the balance of the whole will be the result desired. In all this there seems to be nothing unintelligible, to those who seek truth and ensue it. Again, the expression $\frac{a}{0}$ is only an indication that one of the quantities concerned has been diminished till it has actually vanished ; and that consequently the quantity expressed by the compound

symbol $\frac{a}{0}$ must at the same time have become indefinitely great, or be under such circumstances that no assignable greatness will enable it to answer to the conditions laid down. For example, if the length of the co-secant c, expressed in numbers, is stated to be equal to $\frac{r^2}{s}$; what is typified by this statement is, that as the sine s is made less in consequence of the diminution of the arc, the co-secant increases in the inverse ratio, and that if the arc and sine are reduced to absolutely nothing, the line which has hitherto formed the co-secant will at that precise period be in such a situation that no imaginable length shall enable it to join the line on which the co-tangents have been hitherto marked off. No man ever uses, makes, or produces such an expression as $\frac{a}{0}$, but on such an occasion as this; and when the occasion comes, it is impossible to say that all is not as it ought to be, or that it would not be a hole and a defect in nature if the appearance was anything but what it is. The expression $\frac{0}{0}$ is in substance of the same kind. Suppose, for example, a certain quantity has been ascertained to be always equal to $\frac{2a - 2b}{a - b}$. In this case it is plain that the quantity sought is the number 2; and that it is equally so, whatever may be the comparative magnitudes of a and b with respect to each other. And if one or both of them are of variable magnitude, and a time comes when one is equal to the other, so that the actual amount of the numerator and denominator is each at that time nothing;—it is not the less true that the quantity collected from dividing one by the other in all the states where they can be said to exist at all, is equal to 2. The only inference, therefore, from the expression $\frac{0}{0}$, is that if any person is so unlucky or so obstinate as to try to collect the quotient of two quantities when the said quantities are in the act of evanescing, he can form no judgment of the quotient at all, or more properly of what *would* have been the quotient if he had taken the more sensible course of comparing the two quantities before they were extinct. All that is proved

is, that nothing has been proved; and therefore what the algebraist has to do is to warn his pupil, that if ever in the changes and chances of algebraic transformation such an expression should present itself as $\frac{0}{0}$, he is to beware of thence deriving any inference respecting the relative magnitudes of the two quantities while they were still existent, and most of all of concluding that there was any necessity for their having been equal during such their life-time. In all this there seems to be nothing but what is quite fair and above-board, and nothing of which it may not justly be predicated, that it would be very odd indeed if it were otherwise.

The expression $\sqrt{-a}$ is a different kind of thing. It stands the opprobrium of algebraic science; and happy man will be his dole, that can explain it. At the same time all analogy is in favour of the expectation, that it will either be explained or shown to be founded in some erroneous assumption. The inventors of science must have met with abundance of phænomena of equally inexplicable appearance, till time and consideration solved the difficulties. It would therefore be highly rash to set a thing down among absurdities, because it has not been explained. The world is in its infancy in respect of athletic vigour of comprehension. Future generations will probably know the whole nature of negative roots; as they will laugh at their predecessors who were obliged to settle the theory of parallels by an axiom. Mr. Frend—if lecture room reminiscences of thirty years agone are not deceptive—endeavoured to explain them by a reference to perpendicularity. Nobody else was likely to throw much light upon them, except Mr. Frend's old adversary and ill-user Dean Milner; and though the writer sat at the feet of that Gamaliel, and may say of him "Ἔχω γὰρ ἃ 'χω διὰ σὲ, κ' οὐκ ἄλλον βροτῶν *, nothing precise is recollected to have proceeded from him upon the subject, and it is believed he died and made no sign. Some illumination seems possible to be acquired from the fact, that in show at least, a quantity may be divided into two portions the product of which shall be greater than the product of the two halves; as may be exemplified by solving after the ordinary course the equation $x \times (16 - x) = 70$. It seems undeniable that $8 + \sqrt{-6}$ and $8 - \sqrt{-6}$ must be together equal to 16; the fact being independent of all possible qualities of the final

* "For I have what I have, through thee, and none other of mortal men." —Oedipus to Theseus. *Sophocles, Oed. Col.*

member. But what *is* this last apparition, which taken by itself appears to defy possibility, and yet being compounded according to the allowed rules in other cases, produces the result + 6 ? The presumption is strong, that there is a want of predefinition somewhere. Is $\sqrt{-6}$ the symbol of a bargain, a stipulation, that if ever this hieroglyphic occurs twice together with the sign of multiplication interposed, the subtraction of 6 shall be the result: and that to all other intents the symbol shall be inert? Or is this only a description, instead of approaching to an explanation? At all events it looks very much as if the comparison of all the cases in which the negative root produces striking or strange effects, might at some time enable somebody to pronounce upon the true nature of the dæmon, which the hap-hazard turning over the magic book of algebra has turned out upon the wondering eyes of the exorcists.

On the Article on "A System of Popular Geometry" in No. IV, some observations may likewise be made. There is an ancient adage touching "royal" roads to geometry, which is for the most part exceedingly applicable to what are called "popular" ones; and therefore encouragement should have been given to every symptom of a disposition to turn the popular feeling into the track of demanding increased, instead of diminished, accuracy of demonstration. It is impossible to concede, that demonstration is what is "dry." On the contrary, the gust for demonstration may be roused in mere children; and what revolts and oppresses them, is being told to remember and believe that "this *is* because it *is*." The axiom that "two straight lines cannot inclose a space," should have been admitted to have been "the mere definition of the words" *straight lines*, as is afterwards done with the axiom on "equality." And Mr. Darley should have been encouraged in his heterodoxy on the subject of parallels; though it is certain the encouragement could not be extended to an "ungeometrical theory," if Mr. Darley has put one forth. What it is that has been put forth, it would have been well to have described. The misfortune of the asserted "evidence to the senses" that there is *one position only* in which a revolving straight line will not meet another that is fixed, is,—that what is evident to the senses is, that there is a considerable interval, a very substantial and visible *hiatus*, within which no man can tell whether the lines will meet or not. That they may be made to meet on one side and on the other, is plain; and that the limits between which it is disputed whether they will meet, may be perpetually reduced on both sides, is also plain. But to argue that *therefore* it is certain that the disputed interval

may be reduced to nothing or to any smallness that may be assigned, would be an argument for a *Junior Optimè* in expectation to take off in the schools. It will be true if the angle to be got rid of is equal to the possible sum of the decrements, and it will not if it is not; but whether it is or not, is simply the point under inquiry. Has any demonstration been ever given, that the sum of the decrements can be increased till it is necessarily greater than any angle that is less, by any quantity however minute, than the angle in question? If it has not, all that the evidence of the senses amounts to on the occasion, is that it presents nothing to the contrary.

The general inference intended is, that it is according to the spirit and the interest of the age, to encourage all manner of scepticism in geometry. That instead of anything like huddling up a difficulty or a defect, it should be proclaimed on the house-tops, and all men be called upon to witness the deficiency, and endeavour by patient and reiterated improvements to remove the shame. On the tendency of such a course to produce effects on the concerns of common life, it is needless to dilate. The priesthood in France had such a consciousness on this point, that in the seminaries under their direction previously to July 1830, they had endeavoured to withdraw the study of geometry, and substitute a course of chemical recreations. The lesson is by many degrees too good to be forgotten.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 October, 1831.

ART. XV.—*Appel aux Représentants de la France et à mes Concitoyens.* Par Louis Le Dieu.—Paris. 1831.

SINCE the completion of the Article entitled "France and her Revolution," two events of great importance have occurred. Warsaw has fallen; and the French Chamber of Deputies has virtually determined by a large majority, that the Cossacks shall make a *joyeuse rentrée* into Paris. It may be very well for Frenchmen to deceive themselves and one another; but there is no treaty between the two countries, by which any Englishman is bound to be misled by sympathy. The vast majority of the English people honestly threw aside all prejudices and partialities, and burst into an unmixed expression of congratulation on the apparent restoration of France to her high station among nations. They did more; for they joined in the common demand for political reform; and by thus entering into partnership, they earned a right to criticize the conduct of the foreign branch of the general concern.

And no Englishmen *have* been misled. They have seen,—

with sorrow most; and a few with joy,—that from the moment the new French government was established at the helm, it was manœuvring with a view to bring in the Holy Alliance to settle the dispute. From the instant that room was given to discern the temper of the actual constituency to whom the destinies of France were so unfortunately turned over by the men of the Three Days, it was plain that two-thirds sighed for the quiet putting down the Revolution of July by foreign pressure, and looked only for the apparition of *nos amis les ennemis* upon such terms as should best secure the ultimate rise of Three per Cents. Considerable expectations were grounded on what would be the result of the fall of Warsaw. It was supposed that by such an event the heroine of the piece might be alarmed into resistance; but the danger has passed over with a little noise, and the heroine is by this time fitted for a Magdalene. There will be another *émeute* when the allies pass the Rhine; and the Carabiniers will put it down, And another when the first Cossack is seen from the barriers; and the day afterwards, "Order will reign in Paris." This is the English version of French policy. There is no quarrelling with fate; it appears that it must be, and therefore the English must submit. The French of course will console themselves with the possession of what Franklin would call their "whistle;" they have escaped the chimæra of a republic. Only let there be no complaint against their English friends; nor any assertion that the cry of treason was not raised from the opposite shores in their behalf, or that the English were a party to the partition which the French stock-holders have invited. On the English, meanwhile, the lesson will not be lost. It makes one example more, of the blessings which arise to nations from a limited representation; and comes most opportunely in the present conjuncture of their own struggle for reform.

The present Appeal to the citizens of France, is one of those fruitless efforts, by which an honourable individual acquits his conscience of responsibility for not having resisted his country's fall. That it will be useless to any public effect, is clear. It has already drawn down persecution on the author; though for some reason or other the hearts of his pursuers appear to have failed them in their progress. As intimated in the extract appended, it is probable he will give them no cause of offence in future. Since the fall of Warsaw, such a writer could only address his countrymen in the language of Padilla, "Yesterday was the time to have displayed the resolution of warriors, to-day there is nothing but the resignation of Christians."

The extract here added, contains the conclusion of the "Letter to the King," which was made the object of judicial interference. It will be read with interest and advantage, as containing a just and vivid exposure of the combined weakness and treachery by which France has fallen. It remains only to be seen, whether England intends to stand.

'When two years ago, Sire, I was finding fault with the measures and the ministers that had been forced upon the country by the insanity of the restored government, if any person had said to me, "The warmest of your wishes will be fulfilled; the duke of Orleans will have the throne; but the country will gain nothing by it; weaker and worse men than ever, will take the reins of Government; you will yourself be the object of their malice, and be treated as an enemy of public order;" I should never have brought myself to give it my belief. Nevertheless, it is what has come to pass, and what now obliges me to write.

'My letter has been already of considerable length; yet I feel under the necessity of extending it, not for my own sake, Sire, but for yours. Your speeches and public acts announce too clearly that the truth has ceased to reach you, for me to hesitate in laying it before you, though possibly I may be writing to you for the last time.

'Your government has not fulfilled either the hopes which were conceived of it, or the promises you made. From its outset it has thrown itself into the luckless path, which was the ruin of the elder branch of your family, and, if you persist in it, will infallibly be your own. You know with what confidence I always foretold the expulsion of that elder branch; and believe me I feel an assurance stronger still, of the impossibility of your maintaining yourself any more than they, without a speedy change of system and of men.

'For a year nothing has been talked of but maintaining the dignity of France, preserving her in a state of honourable peace, and bringing back the prosperity of industry and commerce by the restoration of security and order; yet the nation was never in a more deplorable, a more humiliating condition, even during the time its territory was occupied by foreign armies. At no time were opinions more divided; at none were their divisions attended with more violence; and never did the people, in searching for the causes of all they suffer and all they fear, refer the blame more immediately to the conduct of the highest individual in the state.

'Your counsellors and courtiers will probably deny this, and perhaps get the courts of law to declare it to be criminal. In the same way, under Charles X, it was held factious to express any doubt of the tender interest, the admiration, which all the nation felt for that chivalrous sovereign. I remember a deputy, a good *ultra* too, once saying under the Martignac ministry, that Charles X was losing the confidence and affection of his people; and he was called to order by the majority, who were afterwards the celebrated 221, and it was this 221 that drove Charles X from France. They gave the crown to you, without troubling themselves whether they had a right or not. On

the first change of circumstances, the greater part of them will be ready to take it from you after the same fashion.

'I know the men well, Sire, whom a sad fatality has enabled to place themselves round your popular throne. I find among them, as I have told you elsewhere, "the bullies of every party in its turn, the minions of every tyrant, and in their train the puppets of all regimes, the toad-eaters of everything in power, who for fifty years, under all our changes, have never done anything but bend their knees, and bow their heads, and hold out their hands to beg." These are the sort of men, who loaded with gold and with disgrace, are found clamouring in the name of public order, for the preservation of every kind of despotism we have ever known; and who, when we ask for the laws of a free country and the security of equal rights, accuse us of wishing for anarchy and the guillotine. They parody the language of Louis XIV, and say "The state is themselves" and their heirs after them; and we who stand up for the rights of the country against their claims, are rebels, and to be treated as guilty of high treason.

'You had to make a choice, Sire, between these men and the country; and they speedily cut off our chance by involving you in their systems, surrounding you with their agents, and keeping away from you (and they tell us, by your own desire) all the men who under every change have been faithful to their country and to freedom; the men, too, who for many years had looked forward to you as the saviour of the state. To make themselves your masters, they cut you off from your friends; just as, to make themselves masters of France, they stifled her enthusiasm, and lost her the affections of every country upon earth.

'At this moment, the men who a little time ago considered you as identified with all the interests of France, feel themselves obliged to give up their old affections, to preserve their principles. I hear it from numbers of them every day; but I am not going to state their names, for I mean to denounce nobody but myself. Many a time, in the last ten months, on viewing the system your ministers have pursued, and which they insist is yours still more than it is theirs, I have felt myself drawn on, from astonishment to grief, from grief to a feeling of something like hate; and I have found it impossible to confine my complaints within my own breast, or conceal my sense of injury in deference to your rank. And if *I* felt thus—I with whose past life you are acquainted, and know my constancy to old attachments—what must be the case with those who never had any regard for you at all, and knew you only by your rank and your family descent, which they were in the habit of viewing as two evils joined in one?

'Cut off from the affections of the men who are devoted to their country, drawn on to govern in the interest of the few instead of the many, with no hold upon public consent, which you might have carried with you a year ago, but which at the present day would be disputed and perhaps refused you altogether; where are you to find those elements of conservative power you cannot go on without,—or which way look for the safety of yourself, of liberty, and France?

'You have been told again and again, that in the eyes of the kings

of all the continent, you are a usurper. By the very fact that you belonged to the ancient dynasty, the legitimates are bound to hate you the more; because you have given a bad example to their own relations, as it is easier for a prince of the blood to have views upon the crown and to obtain it, than a private citizen. The declaration of the general principle of the sovereignty of the people was your only defence, your only chance of safety; and ever since the revolution of July, your ministers have been sacrificing with equal perfidy the rights of the French people, and of every other people in existence; we everywhere find them hand in hand with despotism; their object was, and still is, to re-establish it in France; and at this very moment you will find yourself left alone to face the enemy at home and the enemy abroad. Such a position no man on earth can hold.

'You must retrace your steps; it is your fate, and you must do it in the end. But the longer it is put off, the harder it will be; lose no time, then, in giving us a repetition of your younger years. Send away the counsellors that have misled you. Lay hold, as you did at twenty, of the standard of freedom; lead on, as you did then, the song of battle; move boldly towards the enemy, who is surrounding you on all sides, and there is not one among us that will not follow where you lead; you will see whether the continent does not give way as you advance, and whether you do not easily recover the ascendant which cowards have made you lose.

'The decision is with yourself. I have done you the last service that I can. The time is close at hand, when like your predecessor you will no longer have your choice, whether you will arrest the torrent which the misfortunes of Poland, the surrender of Belgium, the betrayal of Italy, and the sufferings in the interior, will bring upon you from all quarters The present is still your own; tomorrow may be too late.'—*Letter to the King. 24 July*, 1831.

In the note* below, is given a fac-simile of the way in which the fall of Warsaw was announced in one of the great towns of

---

* From the Manchester Times and Gazette, 24 Sept. 1831.

WARSAW has fallen into the hands of the barbarian troops—the advance guards of the hordes which threaten liberty throughout the enlightened part of Europe. Had England possessed a government in which the people had their proper share, and had not her power been withered by a long course of misrule that has bound her hand and foot, this event would not have occurred. Had the government of France marched with the revolution of July, this event would not have occurred. The Parisians may again see a bivouac of Cossacks in the Boulevards.

England which was among the first to send its congratulations to the patriots of July. It is only necessary to add, that there was no previous concert in the opinion with which it is concluded.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, 1 October, 1831.

ART. XVI.—*Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine; for August and September* 1831.

'MANUFACTURES, in every age and quarter of the globe, have been the prolific source of democratic feeling. We need not appeal to history for a confirmation of this eternal truth;—its exemplification is too manifest in the present times, to admit of a moment's doubt. Now, of the whole population of Great Britain, *two-thirds* are, according to the census of 1821, employed in trade and manufactures; and, by the recent enumeration, the proportion will probably be still greater. It is this fatal, and now irretrievable direction of our industry, which renders the Reform Bill so eminently hazardous. The great bulk of these manufacturers reside in the small towns; the members they return will be the faithful mirror of their democratic opinions. Their number is daily increasing;—every successive year brings one of the rural boroughs within the vortex of manufacturing wealth, and the contagion of manufacturing democracy. Look at Preston, Stockport, Salford, Bolton, Halifax, Macclesfield, in England; or Kilmarnock, Airdrie, Montrose, or Paisley, in Scotland, and an idea may be formed of the democratic tendency of small manufacturing towns.'—*Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine. No. for Aug.* 1831. *Part II. p.* 294.

'It is true that I am consumed with a burning—a just—I will presume to say, a righteous indignation at the atrocious scenes now passing in this country. True it is that I sicken with disgust at seeing those things sanctioned [sanctioned? nay moved and precipitated] by the very rulers of the land which but a few years since were agitated as the mere reveries of sedition, by a few branded and stigmatized incendiaries. True it is that I shudder at seeing ministers, senates, and the nobles of the land co-operating with drunken zealots to bring about changes—for less than the least of which but a dozen of years ago, men, women, and children, having the excuse of utter ignorance, were hunted by cavalry, cut down or trampled under their horses' hoofs by yeomanry, thrown by crowds into dungeons, and afterwards pursued to ruin and beggary,—exiled, or even decimated by the executioner.'—*Id. p.* 315.

'*North.*—I bet you a riddle of claret they are in power again in two months. Of that I have very little doubt;—would to God I could be as sure of their behaving themselves as they ought to do after the thing is done!

Tickler.—Upon what, in the name of Jupiter, do you build your hopes? I met with nobody in London who even hinted at the possibility of such things; and since I left it—you see what majorities!

North.—Never mind. I put not my faith in princes—for that would be forgetting the words of Holy Writ; but, begging your pardon, I still put my faith in Peers. The Committee will cut the Bill well down yet before it goes to the Lords, and the Lords will do the rest of the business, and Lord Grey will resign next morning, and William the Fourth, *nolens volens*, will send for Sir Robert Peel, and Sir Robert Peel will make up a Cabinet within eight-and forty hours, and deliver a plain, perspicuous oration, detailing what Reform *he* is willing to patronise, and dissolve the Parliament——

Tickler.—And what then?

North.—Why, nothing uncommon. The majority of the House of Commons are *not*—not being *fools*, mere fools they cannot possibly be—sincere; and they will be delighted to find their Bill destroyed, and they will vapour and palaver, and do nothing. By that time, moreover, the horrible stagnation in every branch of internal trade, for which the nation has to thank Lord Grey, and of which people even in lofty places are already beginning to feel the effects, will have come to such a pass as to command attention in all quarters to something much more interesting, as well as important, than *any* reform. By that time, again, there will be no Peers in France, and the Duke of Orleans will be safely housed in his old villa at Twickenham, (which, like a sensible man, he has, I am told, always refused to let)—and there will be war by land, and war by sea—and there will be a bit of a dust at Manchester or elsewhere, and it will be laid in blood, and the new Parliament will be chosen in peace and jollity, and consist, with few exceptions, of gentlemen—and Peel's Reform—bad enough probably, but still something bearable as compared with this iniquity—will be introduced, and we shall jog on pretty much in the old way again—that is, conquer right and left as long as any body dares to keep the field before us, be too grand not to sacrifice all we have gained at the cost of our own gold and blood whenever a peace is to be made, and then, Europe being once more settled, buckle ourselves once more to the glorious task of unsettling England—that is to say, adopt Whig measures—on, and on, until the national appetite is at last so depraved that it calls out for some radical bolus, and nothing can save us, or our children rather, from bolting the murderous crudity, except, at the distance perhaps of twenty years, just such another series of sayings and doings as, please God, will for ever illustrate, in Tory annals, the memory of the autumn of 1831.'—*Id. p.* 413.

'*Tickler.*—Bide a wee. There's a braw time comin'. He's get his fairin' belyve.'—*Id. No. for Sept. p.* 555.

'*Tickler.*—In which case the *descensus in avernum* would proceed at a locomotive rate.

North.—Yes. We should see a constitutional assembly next winter—the Bishops unfrocked, the Peers unermined, the three per cents struck down to two (to begin with), the pensions abolished, and the corn law scattered to chaff—all within the course of the spring—and then, most probably, according to the old chant of Mother Skipton's doggerel—

"A bloody summer, and no king."

Tickler.—I doubt as to the blood. Who is enough in earnest to fight for any thing but property? And if a general attack upon property should really take place, where are the materials for any thing like a defence?

North.—Why, I can easily suppose that—the present concern being got rid of—the agricultural population at large—excepting, of course, those counties in which the *illegal* system of the poor laws has had time to work its proper consequences on the mind of man, woman, and child—might very probably be stimulated to take the side of the conservators. In fact, there can be no doubt that such would be the case in Scotland and Wales universally; and I can't well question it would be about as generally so in the north of England, where the gentry, as a class, have all along done their duty, and are liked and respected accordingly. We should have, then, the manufacturing mob on the one side, the farmers and peasantry, as a body, on the other. So far the match might perhaps be not unequal—the accumulation of the former in particular places making up, considerably at least, for their absolute inferiority of numbers. If so, the question would really be a simple one—Which side would the army take? And how they would be, depends of course mainly on the, in my opinion, altogether open point, whether the movement had, or had not, government patronage on its side. I don't, of course, mean the patronage of this government—that would be long over ere then.

Tickler.—In so far as I know the *British* army, it might be counted on with great security.

North.—We need not bother ourselves about the Irish—that affair would be in other hands before then.

Tickler.—What if the army should be as disunited as the rest?

North.—Possibly. And in that case we should indeed see campaigning. There never was such an army as OURS is at this moment since the battle of Pharsalia; and I see no reason to anticipate that, if it were divided, the upshot should be reached in less than the five long years it cost Cæsar and Pompey to decide their quarrel. There are, probably, among the regimental officers abundance of old Peninsulars, who would have no great objections to play for such stakes as they have read or heard of elsewhere. The worst of all is, that we should want now-a-days that strong, fervid feeling of religious obligation which did prevail among us in the days of Charles the First, and which, even in the midst of horrors, did continually operate as a check on all sides. Read the Memoirs of a Cavalier*, or Mrs. Hutchinson's, or Lady Fanshawe's, and consider for a moment what a dismal contrast, as to *details*, a seven years' term of modern civil war would be likely to present. I abhor the thought.

Tickler.—It must be some comfort to you, that, according to your theory, Scotland here would escape.

North.—We must not be too sure of that neither. I suspect we should have a fierce tussle even here, though comparatively a very

---

* *By the Author of Robinson Crusoe.* Did the writer know that, or not?—1839.

brief one. Most probably our yeomanry—the finest fellows I do believe that ever were embodied in military corps since the world began, the most steady, honest, trustworthy, and kindhearted good men, I venture to say, that ever wore uniform—Our yeomanry would most probably put down any insurrection in this quarter in a month—but granting that, good God, what a month! It would be a horrid time, indeed, for old cocks like us, that could not mount and take a hand in the game. Only think of Glasgow, or dear Paisley, in the power of the rascals for a week—yea, for a day!'—*Id. p.* 556.

'*North.*—I trust our own old Plain Speaker has a campaign or two in him yet.

Tickler.—Ay, barring accidents, a round dozen of them, if need be. He had been pulled down a little with the *grippe* when I saw him first; but before I left town, his cheeks had plumped out again, and he looked fit for any thing. His eye has lost nothing of its eagle brightness; he walks to this hour as straight as a ramrod; and his leg is as perfect as it could have been at thirty. He is to the fore yet, thank God—heart, soul, bone, and blood—but if it were otherwise, we have pretty cards in the pack.

North.—Combermere—Hill—Kemp—all fine fellows, and in full vigour.

Tickler.—Ay, and Murray and Hardinge, either of them well worth your three.

North.—What a beautiful picture of the old cavalier is Sir George Murray. I know nothing like it in that style.

Tickler.—Nor I, and Pickersgill's portrait, in this year's exhibition, does him as much justice, by Jupiter, as either Lawrence, or Vandyke, or Velasquez could have done. But somehow, Sir George appears to me to carry a certain tinge of languor about him—his eye is so gentle, calm, melancholy, pensive—I should doubt of there being quite enough stimulus.

North.—No fears,—the first "clarion—clarion wild and shrill" would send the blood tumbling through him like another Garry. We have always had Platoffs and Bluchers among us enow, I warrant ye—but we have sometimes felt the want of a Gneisenau—and this soft-eyed hero appears to stand second to Wellington in the opinion of most of his compeers.

Tickler.—He is a cock of the right feather to be sure, and speaks, by the by, as well as if he had never had another trade.

North.—Peradventure better.

Tickler.—However—I am no judge of such concerns, of course—but I strongly suspect if there were a war either at home or abroad, the army would expect to see Hardinge as far forward as any body but the Duke.

North.—We shall have work for Murray here among ourselves. Scotland will look to *him* in the first instance.

"There are hills beyond Pentland and streams beyond Forth,
If there's lords in the Lowlands there's chiefs in the North.
There are wild Dunniewassels three thousand times three,
Will cry, '*Hoich!*' for the bonnet of bonny Dundee!"

What a grand ballad that is! It haunts me like a spirit.

Tickler.—'Tis a clever thing.

North.—You heard Sir Henry Hardinge too?

Tickler.—Several times; but never a set speech. He may not, perhaps, be exactly an orator, which, among other and better things, Nature certainly meant Murray to be; but he has complete command of clear, terse, nervous language—is quick as lightning at retort—has a full, masculine, sonorous voice—considerable dignity of action, too—and, above all, carries with him such an air of upright, manly single-mindedness, high noble feeling, and unaffected modesty, that, judging from the little I saw, I am not sure if any body in the House produces altogether a more powerful effect. His defence of Philpotts was a first-rate thing, and did that job as well as any Cicero could have come up to.

North.—Why, that could not have been a difficult job—for the Bishop's justification of facts was clear as day. Sir Henry lost an arm, didn't he, at Waterloo?

Tickler.—I don't know where it happened, but that, you know, is a mutilation which takes grace from no man. He is the perfect model of a soldier—a short, compact, firm, handsome figure, all buttoned up to the chin in blue and black, and a countenance which, though without the statuesque elegance of Bonaparte's, reminded me more of that in the extraordinary mass of brow, the large, deep-cut, grey, fiery eye, the solid contour of the jaw, the fall of the hair, and the whole style of complexion, than any other head I remember to have met with. This is one of our very first cards. If things go well, he must be a Secretary of State in the next Cabinet—if darkly, he must come down and raise the standard in Yorkshire—for that, I believe, is his calf-country.'—*Id. p.* 560.

Is there any man, of understanding that would save him from being the dupe of one of the Bourbons' *sanitary cordons*, who after reading the extracts given above, can doubt that the Tories meditate a reaction? It is true the statement put forward is, that their preparations are against the case of the people in the progress and results of the Reform Bill making an attack upon property. Let nobody pretend there has been any misrepresentation upon this head; the extracts have been extended beyond reasonable bounds, for the sake of including the statement upon this point. The Tories will aver that their preparations are for another object, and that "nothing but malevolence can misinterpret their intentions;" but who will be misled by the plea? Here is a distinct levying of war against the King's people; officers pointed out on whom the leviers think dependence can be placed, and the probable way in which the army will divide upon the question, calculated. The civil war is begun; and if it is not stopped by the prompt exertions of the community, from this to the battle of Edge-Hill will possibly be some ten weeks. It may be a lamentable thing that the opponents of Reform should have chosen to bring things to

this issue; but at the same time it is a blessed thing, that the Tory staff should in their cups and their vaunting have prematurely let out the plan. No man of common sense can misunderstand either the danger or the remedy. They calculate upon having every man at their mercy, who has committed himself by assistance to Reform. A "brave time" is coming; and the Lord Chancellor is to "get his fairing by-and-by." Did *this* mean a time when the people should make an attack upon property? No man mistakes the meaning of slang of this kind, in the mouths of a desperate party. It means the opportunity of sanguinary revenge, on all who have resisted or opposed them. The war is to be especially against the "manufacturers," who with those "employed in trade," are stated to be "two-thirds of the whole population of Great Britain;" and the manufacturing towns are pointed out by name for "blood." The men are now at their work in the shops and the fields, whose wives are marked to be widows, and children fatherless, unless the designs of the enemy are nipped in the bud by the prompt exertions of the people in every quarter of the country. Are the tender mercies of the Tories unknown; or have men forgotten their massacres, their suspension of law, their military executions, their half-hangings, their putting to the torture, or the grinning heads of the time when dissectors' assistants were in requisition to do the Tory vengeance on their victims? All this is what it must come to again, unless the people of Great Britain have the vigour to prepare themselves instantly for their defence; and that not leisurely or by half-measures, but by one of those simultaneous displays of energy which in moments of crisis save nations. Not a man, high or low, who can be pointed to as having in any instance abetted the cause of reform, but will be exposed to the measure of revenge which his importance or his activity may have made it worth while to bestow on him. Height will be no protection, and lowliness no security. It will end—to take the highest first—in the deposition of the King for another, and the endurance of all the calamities which in the actual situation of things such an event would bring with it in its train. There is no instance of a king so foiled, who has survived as king. The weaknesses of declining years which all must come to, will be made the pretext for removing him from his high office; and a crowd of events are within the scope of probability, which would make the temptation too great for any party, situated as the Tories will be, to resist. Not that the individuals into whose hands these warnings will chiefly fall, are of all men the most keenly moved by prospects of royal woe; but still there is a decent adherence, an honest anxiety, a plain manly wish and instinctive determina-

tion, that a king who has gone beyond the mark of vulgar sovereigns, and incurred the risk in the promotion of the people's cause, should not personally be a sufferer. What the other portions of society will have to undergo, is best told in the words in which the enemy recalls the glories of the gone-by time,—"men, women, and children, having the excuse of utter ignorance, hunted by cavalry, cut down or trampled under their horses' hoofs by yeomanry, thrown by crowds into dungeons, and afterwards pursued to ruin and beggary, exiled, or even decimated by the executioner." This is the Tories' own description, of what "but a dozen years ago," they inflicted on the people for "less than the least" of what the people has now been guilty of attempting. It is no exaggerated statement; it is the enemy's own thoughts in the enemy's own words. The people who cannot take a hint when their enemies speak thus plainly, ought to take the locks off their doors when they hear of thieves being abroad, and run about saying "Come eat me," like roast pigs in the country of Cockaigne.

There is not the smallest reason for despair. The Tories calculate upon the army; but never were men more wrong in their reckoning, than when they say "it might be counted on with great security." Themselves appear to have an inkling of the fact, that "among the regimental officers" there would be "abundance" who from one cause or another would side with their opponents. As the Tories have chosen to begin the calculation, it is but fair to follow it up. And first then, if there should be any attempt to divide the army, let the people recollect the intense interest which, independently of the ideas of honour and duty which of themselves would make thousands of officers take the popular side, all that most influential body the captains and subalterns would feel in supporting the side which held out the prospect of escape from the aristocratical monopoly of promotion. Putting out of question, as before, the higher ideas of duty which would make this class of officers join the portion of the upper classes which sided with the people, this motive alone would operate with intense force on at least three-fourths of the individuals described. And if it operated on *them*, with what vastly increased force would it act upon that more numerous, and still more influential body, as regards the conduct of the masses, the non-commissioned officers. The Spanish constitutionalists sank under the Bourbon invasion, because it never occurred to them to make a dozen serjeants captains upon the field of battle. The French in their revolution were aware of the irresistible effect produced upon an army, by the prospect of advancing the lower classes to their fair share of promotion and reward. If the English soldier

could conquer "under the cold shade of aristocracy," what might not be expected from him when this deadly bar to exertion was removed? But there is a worse reckoning for the enemy still; there would be a cause operating with peculiar force upon the men who have never aspired to a corporal's stripe, a cause which appears to have been cherished with particular zeal, as if on purpose that it should operate at a crisis like the one supposed. The moment a division of the army was attempted, there would be *the whipped army against the unwhipped.* All men, except the rotten part of the aristocracy, know that an officer who, with the prodigious faculties given by military law, with a power of solitary imprisonment almost unlimited, and an opportunity of inflicting misery, disgrace and suffering on every hour of the life of every man beneath his orders, cannot maintain discipline without having recourse to the brutal methods which dishonour the British service,—is one, in the more contemptuous than elegant expression of the common soldier and seaman, "not fit to carry garbage to a bear." But then the rotten part of the aristocracy could not change their mode of discipline or substitute wisdom for folly on the spur of the occasion; or if they made the attempt, their men would laugh at them, and point to the opposite ranks as what they had to thank for the indulgence. Besides these, there are numerous other means by which the portion of the government which acted with the people would operate upon the armed bodies. The navy and marines would be strongly led by professional feelings to side with the sovereign; and they and their officers would at once furnish an incomparable artillery for the defence of posts and passages, and the basis of a disciplined infantry. In the *corps à talents*, the artillery and engineers, the interest of the worse part of the aristocracy would be found feeble, in proportion to the degree in which the officers are drawn from the middle, which are the scientific, classes of society; and it would be completely nullified by the sweeping interest which might be created, by opening to these corps the way to general promotion, and giving the prospect of the command of armies to the young Napoleons they may contain. In addition to all these, would come the vast energies derivable from the people's own exertions. It is well known, that with a mixture of old troops, a good infantry may be made in three weeks. Cavalry requires a longer time; but with good horses and willing men,—tailors, if desired, like those that composed Elliott's regiment,—it is hard if in three months a cavalry could not be made, that with careful leading and some small advantage in numbers, should ride down the proudest of the proud. Make fifty troop-serjeant-majors captains, and the same number of

serjeants and corporals subaltern officers, on condition that they brought their troops into the field in good order in three months; and it would be seen how certainly the thing would be brought to pass.

These considerations, and many more that might be added, show the utter rashness and folly of the plan the Tories have formed of bearing the people down with the army, and executing their vengeances at "Manchester or elsewhere" in "blood;" provided only the community acted with moderate promptitude and vigour. And here there can be no doubt or hesitation about what the community ought now to do; take instantly all legal measures, in combination with the government, for being prepared against the sanguinary reaction the Tories have been pleased to threaten. The trouble is of their own making; they have no right to threaten "blood," and expect that other people are to sit down quietly and wait their pleasure. They have no right to print a list of the officers they wish to see employed upon their staff, and expect that their opponents are not to be ready with another. The country must be prepared against brute force, and will be; and the evidence of the necessity, is in the printed documents here presented. As the further means of reducing temptation to violence, impress everywhere the necessity that will exist, if the attempt is made and put down, of demanding increased security for the well-being of the people; and let that security be the Ballot. Impress moreover on the ministry the necessity of making more extended concessions to national feeling in Ireland, and of engaging the hearty co-operation of the Irish people against an enemy whose success will infallibly be followed by an attempt to restore the old religious inferiorities in that country. The times are urgent; and every man must incur some trouble, to avoid trouble. The Tory plan is in a nutshell, if the country proceeds like one man to quash it without delay. Give it head, and time, and there is no defining to what overpowering magnitude of evil it may rise.

One new reason for exertion has presented itself within the hour. *Warsaw has fallen;* and the Holy Alliance is now in full march on Paris. The French people has suffered itself to be cheated and betrayed, and it is doubtful whether any measures can now arrest the progress of its enemies. The liberal party in the different states of continental Europe cannot be expected efficiently to oppose that progress, at all events till France has a government on which their confidence can be reposed. The probable results are two; either that France will be conquered and partitioned, the Bourbons taking their share; or that it will throw off the form of government that

has given up all its outworks and brought it to its present pass, and establish a republic, though with every chance of being too late. In either case the English Tories will make their market. In the first event, they will ride over us with their Russian allies, as when the English minister pointed to the state of the Continent, and asked what chance there was for popular resistance at home. In the other, they will cry out against the perils of popular power, and the enormity of a people's not submitting to foreigners when asked. If either from carelessness or contempt of danger, the threats of the calf are not provided against now, it will be a bull when the time comes for putting its threats into execution.

In the meanwhile there are sundry measures which the government might pursue, as the means of diminishing the peril of the general fever of the times. The Reform Bill has displayed the fact, known indeed before, that a certain portion of those who pass under the name of Radicals, dislike reform, as being a preventive of revolution; and their special object is, the funds. Even of these, the majority are actuated rather by a vague idea that the destruction of the debt would be public wealth, than by a simple desire of spoliation. But the government should make provision against a storm from this quarter, by doing something to encourage the subdivision of funded property. If every man held a share in exact proportion to his taxes, none would call for confiscation, because it would only be confiscating it from one pocket to put into the other. A government cannot absolutely direct the disposition of funded property, any more than of any other kind; but it can do much to direct the stream. It is time to consider whether something might not be effected in this way, by a tax on funded property in the shape of a moderate per-centage on the excess above a certain sum, as for instance above three thousand pounds. Such an arrangement would shoot over the heads of the small annuitants, and act as a premium on dispersion; and if the others object to it, they should be bound to find a plan which would produce an equivalent effect in promoting subdivision. The question is a public one; and not of the likings or dislikings of individual stock-holders. A provident ministry would further insist on the church's commuting its unpopular and dangerous form of holding its possessions, in some such way as recommended by the late Professor of Political Economy at Oxford*. Two points are especially to be recollected in such a change, as essential to making it in any shape a peace-offering to a people

* *A Letter to Lord Howick, on a Legal Provision for the Irish Poor; Commutation of Tithes, and a Provision for the Irish Roman Catholic Clergy.* By Nassau William Senior, Esq.—Second Edition. London. Murray. 1831. (*p. 64 and following.*)

whom it would not be safe to attempt to deceive. One is, that whatever the church may charge for, she has no right to charge for the gains that would ensue, but of which no part could come to her under the existing system. And the other is, that the commutation must be final, and free from all reference to future valuations; the country being incomparably too enlightened to be taken in by a commutation which should preserve the old gratuitous check on the improvement of the land. On these points it might be necessary to use a little gentle force. The church is clinging distressfully, like a fat old lady to a wreck; and must be carried shrieking into the long-boat, by those who are better able to discern the symptoms of the times. Without in the slightest degree waiving the principle, that what is called the property of the church is as simply the creature of the legislature for the time being as the property of a colonel in his regiment, subject only, like that, to a decent regard for existing interests,—an agreement on this point between the government and the great mass of the reformers, would be a source of confidence and strength to both.

If any of these statements displease the timid and the feeble, they must be told that the English people cannot afford to throw themselves away like the French and Belgians, in the hope that something will hinder them from being attacked. The enemy's plan is out; and if by this last imprudence the Tories have thrown away their chance, let God be thanked and nobody but themselves be blamed. It is the English crisis; and Europe waits to see whether the people of Great Britain will make the lame and impotent conclusion, which has befallen in the other cases. If they do, let them recollect, when the hoof is in their bowels, that they were warned of the danger and exhorted to prepare.

END OF VOL. I.

PRINTED BY W. CLOWES AND SONS, STAMFORD STREET, LAMBETH.

00027637

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 09 March, 2016